arXiv:1304.6421v1 [math.RA] 23 Apr 2013

KUMJIAN-PASK ALGEBRAS OF LOCALLY CONVEX HIGHER-RANK GRAPHS

LISA ORLOFF CLARK, CLAIRE FLYNN, AND ASTRID AN HUEF

Abstract. The Kumjian-Pask algebra of a higher-rank graph generalises the Leavitt path algebra of a directed graph. We extend the definition of Kumjian-Pask algebra to row-finite higher-rank graphs Λ with sources which satisfy a local-convexity condition. After proving versions of the graded-uniqueness theorem and the Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem, we study the Kumjian-Pask algebra of rank-2 Bratteli diagrams by studying certain finite subgraphs which are locally convex. We show that the desourcification procedure of Farthing and Webster yields a row-finite higher-rank graph $\tilde{\Lambda}$ without sources such that the Kumjian-Pask algebras of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and Λ are Morita equivalent. We then use the Morita equivalence to study the ideal structure of the Kumjian-Pask algebra of Λ by pulling the appropriate results across the equivalence.

1. Introduction

The Kumjian-Pask algebras were introduced in [8] as higher-rank analogues of the Leavitt path algebras associated to a directed graph E. Since they were introduced in [1] and [7], the Leavitt path algebras have attracted a lot of attention, see, for example, [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 27, 28, 29]. A k-graph is a category Λ with a degree functor $d : \Lambda \to \mathbb{N}^k$ which generalise the path category of E and the length function $\lambda \mapsto |\lambda|$ on the paths λ of E, respectively. Thus we think of the set Λ^0 of objects as vertices and of the morphisms $\lambda \in \Lambda$ as paths of "shape" or degree $d(\lambda)$, and demand that paths factor uniquely: if $d(\lambda) = m + n$ in $\mathbb{N}^k$, then there exist unique $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ with $d(\mu) = n$ and $d(\nu) = m$ such that $\lambda = \mu\nu$.

Let R be a commutative ring with 1 and Λ a row-finite k-graph without sources. The authors of [8] construct a graded algebra $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$, called the Kumjian-Pask algebra, which is universal for so-called Kumjian-Pask families (see page 4 below). If $k = 1$ then $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is isomorphic to the Leavitt path algebra $L_R(E)$, where E is the directed graph with vertices the objects of Λ and edges the paths of degree 1.

Here we define a Kumjian-Pask algebra for row-finite k-graphs which may have sources but are "locally convex", a condition which restricts the types of sources that can occur. We were motivated by the study of C^*-algebras and Kumjian-Pask algebras of "rank-2 Bratteli diagrams" in [19, 8]. These Bratteli diagrams are 2-graphs Λ without sources, but their Kumjian-Pask algebras can profitably be studied by looking at finite subgraphs Λ_N which have sources but are locally convex. In [8], $\mathrm{KP}_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$ was analysed by embedding it inside $C^*(\Lambda)$, and then using the C^*-subalgebras $C^*(\Lambda_N)$ of the subgraphs to deduce

---

Date: 18 April, 2013.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W50.

Key words and phrases. Kumjian-Pask algebra, higher-rank graph, Leavitt path algebra, Cuntz-Krieger algebra, graph algebra.

The first author was supported by a University of Otago research grant and the second author was supported by a grant from the Division of Sciences at the University of Otago.

results about $\mathrm{KP}_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$. A sample theorem obtained in this way illustrates how the dichotomy for Leavitt path algebras of [3, Theorem 4.5] does not hold for Kumjian-Pask algebras. In particular, [8, Theorem 7.10] gives a class $\mathcal{C}$ of rank-2 Bratteli diagrams such that for each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}$, $\mathrm{KP}_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$ is simple but is neither purely infinite nor locally matricial. A key performance indicator for our new definition of the Kumjian-Pask algebra was an extension of [8, Theorem 7.10] to arbitrary fields, and this is achieved in Theorem 5.8 below. For more motivation, the K-theory of the C^*-algebras of these rank-2 Bratteli diagrams was computed in [19] as a direct limit of the K-groups of suitable $C^*(\Lambda_N)$, and a similar approach should work to compute the algebraic K-theory of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$.

Now let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. After finding the appropriate notion of Kumjian-Pask family of Λ in this setting, we have obtained a new Kumjian-Pask algebra $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ with a very satisfactory theory: $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is generated by a universal Kumjian-Pask family (p, s) and the properties of (p, s) ensure that $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) = \operatorname{span}\{s_\lambda s_{\mu^*} : \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda\}$ (see §3), and there are versions of both the graded-uniqueness and the Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorems (see §4). Then, several applications of the graded-uniqueness theorem shows that for Λ in the class $\mathcal{C}$ mentioned above, $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is neither purely infinite nor locally matricial (see §5).

There is a construction by Farthing [13] and Webster [30], called the desourcification of Λ, which yields a row-finite k-graph $\tilde{\Lambda}$ without sources such that the C^*-algebras $C^*(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $C^*(\Lambda)$ are Morita equivalent. In §7, we show that $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ are Morita equivalent as well. This result is new even when $k = 1$ and Λ is the path category of a row-finite directed graph. In §§8-9 we study the ideal structure of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ by pulling the relevant results for $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ from [8] across the Morita equivalence. Thus we obtain graph-theoretic characterisations of basic simplicity and simplicity, and show that there is a lattice isomorphism between the graded basic ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ and the saturated, hereditary subsets of Λ^0.

2. Preliminaries

We write $\mathbb{N}$ for the set of non-negative integers. We view $\mathbb{N}$ as a category with one object. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. We often write $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ as $(n_1, \dots, n_k)$, and say $m \le n$ in $\mathbb{N}^k$ if and only if $m_i \le n_i$ for all $1 \le i \le k$. We use e_i for the usual basis elements in $\mathbb{N}^k$, so that e_i is 1 in the ith coordinate and 0 in the others. We denote the join and meet in $\mathbb{N}^k$ by $\vee$ and $\wedge$ respectively.

A *k-graph* (Λ, d) is a countable category Λ with a functor $d : \Lambda \to \mathbb{N}^k$, called the *degree map*, satisfying the *factorisation property*: if $d(\lambda) = m+n$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, then there exist unique μ and ν in Λ such that $d(\mu) = m, d(\nu) = n$ and $\lambda = \mu\nu$. In this case, we often write $\lambda(0, m)$ for μ.

We denote the set of objects in Λ by Λ^0 and use the factorisation property to identify the morphisms $d^{-1}(0)$ of degree 0 and Λ^0. We write r and s for the domain and codomain maps from Λ to Λ^0. The path category associated to a directed graph is a 1-graph, and motivated by this we call r and s the range and source maps, and elements of Λ and Λ^0 paths and vertices, respectively. For $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^m &:= \{\lambda \in \Lambda : d(\lambda) = m\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^{\neq 0} := \Lambda \setminus \Lambda^0, \\ v\Lambda &:= \{\lambda \in \Lambda : r(\lambda) = v\} \quad \text{(this is denoted } \Lambda(v) \text{ in [20])}, \\ v\Lambda^m &:= \Lambda^m \cap v\Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Example 2.1. Fix $m \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^k$ and define

$$\Omega_{k,m} := \{(p, q) \in \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{N}^k : p \le q \le m\}.$$

This is a category with objects

$$\Omega^0_{k,m} = \{p \in \mathbb{N}^k \mid p \le m\},$$

and range and source maps $r(p, q) = p$ and $s(p, q) = q$. Paths (p, q) and (r, s) are composable if and only if $q = r$, and then $(p, q)(q, s) = (p, s)$. With $d : \Omega_{k,m} \to \mathbb{N}^k$ defined by $d((p, q)) = q - p$, the pair $(\Omega_{k,m}, d)$ is a k-graph. We write Ω_k when m is infinite in every coordinate.

Let Λ be a k-graph. Then Λ is *row-finite* if $v\Lambda^n$ is finite for every $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$. A vertex $v \in \Lambda^0$ is a *source* if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $v\Lambda^n = \emptyset$, that is, v receives no paths of degree n. We say Λ is *locally convex* if for every $v \in \Lambda^0$, $1 \le i, j \le k$ with $i \ne j$, $\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}$ and $\mu \in v\Lambda^{e_j}$, the sets $s(\lambda)\Lambda^{e_j}$ and $s(\mu)\Lambda^{e_i}$ are nonempty [20, Definition 3.10]. Thus if Λ has no sources, then Λ is locally convex. In this paper we only consider locally convex, row-finite k-graphs.

Paths, infinite paths and boundary paths. The Cuntz-Krieger relation (KP4) for k-graphs without sources (see page 4 below) involves the sets $v\Lambda^n$ of paths of degree n with range v. When Λ has sources, $v\Lambda^n$ could be empty. The technical innovation in [20] is to introduce the set $\Lambda^{\le n}$ consisting of paths λ with $d(\lambda) \le n$ which cannot be extended to paths $\lambda\mu$ with $d(\lambda) < d(\lambda\mu) \le n$. Thus

$$\Lambda^{\le n} := \{\lambda \in \Lambda : d(\lambda) \le n, \text{ and } d(\lambda)_i < n_i \text{ implies } s(\lambda)\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset\},$$

and then $v\Lambda^{\le n} := v\Lambda \cap \Lambda^{\le n}$ for $v \in \Lambda^0$ is always nonempty. For example, if $n = e_i$ for some $1 \le i \le k$, then

$$v\Lambda^{\le e_i} = \begin{cases} v\Lambda^{e_i} & \text{if } v\Lambda^{e_i} \ne \emptyset; \\ \{v\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A k-graph morphism is a degree-preserving functor. An *infinite path* in a k-graph Λ is a k-graph morphism $x : \Omega_k \to \Lambda$. In a graph with sources, not every finite path is contained in an infinite path, and another technical innovation of [20] is to replace the space Λ^∞ of infinite paths with a space of so-called boundary paths.

Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and $m \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^k$. In Definition 3.14 of [20], a graph morphism $x : \Omega_{k,m} \to \Lambda$ is defined to be a *boundary path* of degree m if

$$v \in \Omega^0_{k,m} \text{ and } v\Omega^{\le e_i}_{k,m} = \{v\} \text{ imply } x(v)\Lambda^{\le e_i} = \{x(v)\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Thus a boundary path maps sources to sources, and every infinite path is a boundary path. We denote the set of boundary paths by $\Lambda^{\le\infty}$. If Λ has no sources, then $\Lambda^{\le\infty} = \Lambda^\infty$. Since we identify the object $n \in \Omega_{k,m}$ with the identity morphism (n, n) at n, we write $x(n)$ for the vertex $x(n, n)$. Then the range of a boundary path x is the vertex $r(x) := x(0)$. We set $v\Lambda^{\le\infty} := \Lambda^{\le\infty} \cap r^{-1}(v)$ and $v\Lambda^\infty := \Lambda^\infty \cap r^{-1}(v)$. A boundary path x is completely determined by the set of paths $\{x(0, n) : n \le d(x)\}$, hence can be composed with finite paths, and there is a converse factorisation property. We denote the partially-defined shift map σ on $\Lambda^{\le\infty}$ which is defined by $\sigma^m(x) = x(m, \infty)$ for $x \in \Lambda^{\le\infty}$ when $m \le d(x)$.

When the k-graph is not locally convex, there is a different definition for $\Lambda^{\le\infty}$ used in [21]: a graph morphism $x : \Omega_{k,m} \to \Lambda$ is in the $\Lambda^{\le\infty}$ of [30] if there exists $n_x \in \mathbb{N}^k$ with $n_x \le m$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ with $n_x \le n \le m$ and $n_i = m_i$ for some i, implies

$x(n)\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset$. The two definitions are equivalent when Λ is locally convex. The next lemma shows that, in general, condition (2.1) is weaker.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose Λ is a k-graph and $x : \Omega_{k,m} \to \Lambda$ is a graph morphism. Then x satisfies condition (2.1) if and only if the following statement holds:*

$$\text{(2.2)} \qquad \text{if } n \in \mathbb{N}^k \text{ such that } n \leq m \text{ and } n_i = m_i \text{ for some } i, \text{ then } x(n)\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset.$$

Proof. First suppose x satisfies condition (2.1), and $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $n \leq m$ and $n_i = m_i$ for some i. Since $n_i = m_i$, $n\Omega_{k,m}^{\leq e_i} = \{n\}$. Now condition (2.1) gives $x(n)\Lambda^{\leq e_i} = \{x(n)\}$. Hence $x(n)\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset$. Thus x satisfies (2.2).

Conversely, suppose x satisfies (2.2). Let $v \in \Omega_{k,m}^0$ such that $v\Omega_{k,m}^{\leq e_i} = \{v\}$. Then $v \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $v \leq m$. Since $v\Omega_{k,m}^{\leq e_i} = \{v\}$, we have $v_i = m_i$. Therefore $x(v)\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset$ by (2.2) and hence $x(v)\Lambda^{\leq e_i} = \{x(v)\}$. Thus x satisfies condition (2.1). □

3. KUMJIAN-PASK Λ-FAMILIES

Throughout this section, Λ is a row-finite k-graph and R is a commutative ring with 1. Define $G(\Lambda) := \{\lambda^* : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$, and call each λ^* a *ghost path*. If $v \in \Lambda^0$, then we identify v and v^*. We extend the degree functor d and the range and source maps r and s to $G(\Lambda)$ by

$$d(\lambda^*) = -d(\lambda), \quad r(\lambda^*) = s(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad s(\lambda^*) = r(\lambda).$$

We extend the factorisation property to the ghost paths by setting $(\mu\lambda)^* = \lambda^*\mu^*$. We denote by $G(\Lambda^{\neq 0})$ the set of ghost paths that are not vertices.

Let Λ be a row-finite k-graph without sources. Recall from [8, Definition 3.1] that a *Kumjian-Pask Λ-family (P, S) in an R-algebra A* consists of two functions $P : \Lambda^0 \to A$ and $S : \Lambda^{\neq 0} \cup G(\Lambda^{\neq 0}) \to A$ such that

(KP1) $\{P_v : v \in \Lambda^0\}$ is an orthogonal set of idempotents in the sense that $P_vP_w = \delta_{v,w}P_v$,

(KP2) for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\neq 0}$ with $r(\mu) = s(\lambda)$, we have

$$S_\lambda S_\mu = S_{\lambda\mu},\ S_{\mu^*}S_{\lambda^*} = S_{(\lambda\mu)^*},\ P_{r(\lambda)}S_\lambda = S_\lambda = S_\lambda P_{s(\lambda)},\ P_{s(\lambda)}S_{\lambda^*} = S_{\lambda^*} = S_{\lambda^*}P_{r(\lambda)},$$

(KP3) for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\neq 0}$ with $d(\lambda) = d(\mu)$, we have

$$S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}P_{s(\lambda)},$$

(KP4) for all $v \in \Lambda^0$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$P_v = \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^n} S_\lambda S_{\lambda^*}.$$

The sum in (KP4) is finite because Λ is row-finite. The relations (KP1)–(KP4) were obtained in [8, §3] by adding to the usual Cuntz-Krieger relations from [17]. A Cuntz-Krieger Λ-family (P, S) in the algebra $B(H)$ of linear bounded operators on a Hilbert space H consists of an orthogonal set $\{P_v\}$ of projections and a set $\{S_\lambda\}$ of partial isometries S_λ with initial projection $P_{s(\lambda)}$, satisfying weaker versions of (KP1)–(KP4). The geometric structure of $B(H)$ is rich enough to yield (KP1)–(KP4) as given above, where S_{λ^*} is the Hilbert space adjoint of S_λ. For example, the Cuntz-Krieger relation corresponding to (KP2) is just $S_\lambda S_\mu = S_{\lambda\mu}$; the rest of (KP2) comes for free. See §3 of [8] for more detail.

An important consequence of the Kumjian-Pask relations is that the algebra generated by a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family (P,S) is $\operatorname{span}_R\{S_\lambda S_{\mu^*} : \lambda,\mu\in\Lambda\}$, where we use the convention that $S_v := P_v$ and $S_{v^*} := P_v$ for $v\in\Lambda^0$. When Λ has no sources, this follows from [8, Lemma 3.3], which says that if $n\geq d(\lambda),d(\mu)$, then

$$S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu = \sum_{d(\lambda\alpha)=n,\ \lambda\alpha=\mu\beta} S_\alpha S_{\beta^*}. \tag{3.1}$$

Definition 3.1 below gives a notion of Kumjian-Pask family which applies to k-graphs Λ with sources. It is based on the approach by Raeburn, Sims and Yeend in [20] for Cuntz-Krieger Λ-families. The purpose of the new relations (KP3′) and (KP4′) is to ensure that we obtain a version of (3.1).

Definition 3.1. Let Λ be a row-finite k-graph (possibly with sources). A Kumjian-Pask Λ-family (P,S) in an R-algebra A consists of two functions $P:\Lambda^0\to A$ and $S:\Lambda^{\neq 0}\cup G(\Lambda^{\neq 0})\to A$ such that (KP1) and (KP2) hold, and

(KP3′) for all $n\in\mathbb{N}^k\setminus\{0\}$ and $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda^{\leq n}$, we have

$$S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}P_{s(\lambda)};$$

(KP4′) for all $v\in\Lambda^0$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}^k\setminus\{0\}$,

$$P_v = \sum_{\lambda\in v\Lambda^{\leq n}} S_\lambda S_{\lambda^*}.$$

Convention. For $v\in\Lambda^0$ we sometimes write S_v and S_{v^*} for P_v.

Since (KP4′) is the same as the fourth Cuntz-Krieger relation of [20, Definition 3.3], we get the following.

Lemma 3.2 ([20, Proposition 3.11])**.** *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. Then (KP4′) holds at $v\in\Lambda^0$ if and only if, for $1\leq i\leq k$ with $v\Lambda^{e_i}\neq\emptyset$, $P_v=\sum_{\lambda\in v\Lambda^{e_i}}S_\lambda S_{\lambda^*}$.*

The next lemma gives a version of (3.1).

Proposition 3.3. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph, (P,S) a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in an R-algebra A, and $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda$. If $n\in\mathbb{N}^k$ such that $d(\lambda),d(\mu)\leq n$, then*

$$S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu = \sum_{\lambda\alpha=\mu\beta,\lambda\alpha\in\Lambda^{\leq n}} S_\alpha S_{\beta^*}.$$

Proof. Fix $n\in\mathbb{N}^k$ such that $d(\lambda),d(\mu)\leq n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu &= (P_{s(\lambda)}S_{\lambda^*})(S_\mu P_{s(\mu)}) \quad \text{by (KP2)}\\
&= \Big(\sum_{\alpha\in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\lambda)}} S_\alpha S_{\alpha^*}\Big)S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu\Big(\sum_{\beta\in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\mu)}} S_\beta S_{\beta^*}\Big) \quad \text{by (KP4}'\text{)}\\
&= \sum_{\alpha\in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\lambda)}}\ \sum_{\beta\in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\mu)}} S_\alpha S_{(\lambda\alpha)^*}S_{\mu\beta}S_{\beta^*} \quad \text{by (KP2)}\\
&= \sum_{\alpha\in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\lambda)}}\ \sum_{\beta\in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\mu)},\lambda\alpha=\mu\beta} S_\alpha P_{s(\mu\beta)}S_{\beta^*}
\end{aligned}$$

by applying (KP3$'$) to each summand. By unique factorisation, for each α there is just one β of the given degree such that $\lambda\alpha = \mu\beta$, and the sums collapse to

$$= \sum_{\alpha \in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\lambda)}, \lambda\alpha = \mu\beta} S_\alpha S_{\beta^*}$$

This proves the lemma after noting that the purely graph-theoretic result [20, Lemma 3.6] says that composing λ with $\alpha \in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\lambda)}$ gives the path $\lambda\alpha \in \Lambda^{\leq n}$. □

Corollary 3.4. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and (P, S) a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in an R-algebra A. The subalgebra generated by (P, S) is* $\operatorname{span}\{S_\alpha S_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \Lambda, s(\alpha) = s(\beta)\}$.

Proof. We have $S_\alpha S_{\beta^*} = S_\alpha P_{s(\alpha)} P_{s(\beta)} S_{\beta^*}$ by (KP2), so $S_\alpha S_{\beta^*} = 0$ unless $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$ by (KP1). The result now follows from Proposition 3.3 and (KP2). □

The set of *minimal common extensions of* $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ is

$$\Lambda^{\min}(\lambda, \mu) := \{(\alpha, \beta) : \lambda\alpha = \mu\beta, d(\lambda\alpha) = d(\lambda) \vee d(\mu)\}.$$

Corollary 3.5. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and (P, S) a family in an R-algebra A satisfying (KP1), (KP2) and (KP4$'$). Then (KP3$'$) holds if and only if, for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$,*

$$S_{\lambda^*} S_\mu = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) \in \Lambda^{\min}(\lambda,\mu)} S_\alpha S_{\beta^*}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Suppose (KP3$'$) holds. Then (P, S) is a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ and apply Proposition 3.3 with $n = d(\lambda) \vee d(\mu)$ to get $S_{\lambda^*} S_\mu = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) \in \Lambda^{\min}(\lambda,\mu)} S_\alpha S_{\beta^*}$.

Conversely, suppose that for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, (3.2) holds. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$ and let $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\leq n}$. Note that $d(\lambda) \vee d(\mu) \leq n$. First suppose that $d(\lambda) = d(\mu)$. Then

$$\Lambda^{\min}(\lambda, \mu) = \begin{cases} \{(s(\lambda), s(\lambda))\} & \text{if } \lambda = \mu; \\ \emptyset & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

and (3.2) gives $S_{\lambda^*} S_\mu = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} P_{s(\lambda)}$. Second, suppose $d(\lambda) \neq d(\mu)$. Then at least one of λ, μ has degree less than n, say $d(\lambda) < n$. But $\lambda \in \Lambda^{\leq n}$, and so there is no α such that $d(\lambda) < d(\lambda\alpha) \leq n$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^{\min}(\lambda, \mu) &= \{(s(\lambda), \beta) : \lambda = \mu\beta, d(\lambda) = d(\lambda) \vee d(\mu)\} \\ &= \{(s(\lambda), \beta) : \lambda = \mu\beta, d(\mu) < d(\lambda)\} \end{aligned}$$

since $d(\lambda) \neq d(\mu)$. But $\mu \in \Lambda^{\leq n}$ too, so $\Lambda^{\min}(\lambda, \mu) = \emptyset$. By (3.2) $S_{\lambda^*} S_\mu = 0$, and $\lambda \neq \mu$ implies that $S_{\lambda^*} S_\mu = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} P_{s(\lambda)}$. Thus in either case, $S_{\lambda^*} S_\mu = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} P_{s(\lambda)}$ as required. □

In order to demonstrate the existence of a nonzero Kumjian-Pask Λ-family we need to impose the "local convexity" condition from [20] as discussed on page 3.

Proposition 3.6. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. Then there exist an R-algebra A and a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family (P, S) in A with $S_\lambda, S_{\lambda^*}, P_v \neq 0$ for all $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$. In particular, for every $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \Lambda^0$, we have $rP_v \neq 0$.*

Proof. We modify the construction of the infinite-path representation of [8] and instead build a 'boundary-path representation'. Let $\mathbb{F}_R(\Lambda^{\leq\infty})$ be the free R-module on $\Lambda^{\leq\infty}$. For each $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$, define functions f_v, f_λ and $f_\mu : \Lambda^{\leq\infty} \to \mathbb{F}_R(\Lambda^{\leq\infty})$ by

$$f_v(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } r(x) = v; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f_\lambda(x) = \begin{cases} \lambda x & \text{if } r(x) = s(\lambda); \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$f_{\mu^*}(x) = \begin{cases} y & \text{if } x = \mu y \text{ for some } y \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By the universal property of free modules, there exist nonzero $P_v, S_\lambda, S_{\mu^*} \in \operatorname{End}(\mathbb{F}_R(\Lambda^{\leq\infty}))$ extending f_v, f_λ and f_{μ^*}. Note that $rP_v \neq 0$ for every $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$.

We claim that (P, S) is a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in the R-algebra $\operatorname{End}(\mathbb{F}_R(\Lambda^{\leq\infty}))$. Relations (KP1) and (KP2) are straight-forward to check. To see (KP3′), fix $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\leq n}$ and $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$. If $r(\mu) \neq r(\lambda)$, then both $S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu = S_{\lambda^*}P_{r(\lambda)}P_{r(\mu)}S_\mu$ and $\delta_{\lambda,\mu}P_{s(\lambda)}$ are 0. So we may assume $r(\mu) = r(\lambda)$. Notice that

$$S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu(x) = \begin{cases} S_{\lambda^*}(\mu x) & \text{if } x(0) = s(\mu) \text{ and } \mu x = \lambda y \text{ for some } y \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\lambda, \mu \in r(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq n}$, $(\mu x)(0, d(\lambda)) = \lambda$ implies either $\lambda = \mu\lambda'$ or $\mu = \lambda\mu'$ for some $\lambda', \mu' \in \Lambda$. But then $\lambda = \mu$ by the definition of $\Lambda^{\leq n}$. Hence $(\mu x)(0, d(\lambda)) = \lambda$ if and only if $\mu = \lambda$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\lambda^*}S_\mu(x) &= \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x(0) = s(\mu) \text{ and } \lambda = \mu; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &= \delta_{\lambda,\mu}P_{s(\lambda)}(x) \end{aligned}$$

and (KP3′) holds.

For (KP4′), fix $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$ with $v\Lambda^{e_i} \neq \emptyset$. Since Λ is locally convex, it suffices to show that $P_v = \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}} S_\lambda S_{\lambda^*}$ by Lemma 3.2. Let $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}} S_\lambda S_{\lambda^*}(x) = \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}} \delta_{\lambda, x(0,e_i)} x &= \begin{cases} x & \text{if } r(x) = v; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ &= P_v(x). \end{aligned}$$ □

We are now ready to show that there is an R-algebra which is "universal for Kumjian-Pask Λ-families"; the proof is very similar to the one for k-graphs without sources [8, Theorem 3.4], so we will just give an outline addressing the main points. This R-algebra is graded over $\mathbb{Z}^k$, and to see that the graded subgroups have a nice description uses Proposition 3.3; so we will need to check carefully that the argument used when Λ has no sources still works when Λ^n is replaced by $\Lambda^{\leq n}$. We will follow the convention of [8] and use lower-case letters for universal Kumjian-Pask families.

Theorem 3.7. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph.*

(a) *There is an R-algebra* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$*, generated by a Kumjian-Pask* Λ*-family* (p, s)*, such that if* (Q, T) *is a Kumjian-Pask* Λ*-family in an R-algebra A, then there exists a unique R-algebra homomorphism* $\pi_{Q,T} : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) \to A$ *such that* $\pi_{Q,T} \circ p = Q$ *and* $\pi_{Q,T} \circ s = T$*. For every* $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ *and* $v \in \Lambda^0$*, we have* $rp_v \neq 0$*.*

(b) *The subsets*

$$\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_n := \mathrm{span}\{s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} : d(\alpha) - d(\beta) = n\}$$

form a $\mathbb{Z}^k$*-grading of* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$*.*

Proof. Let $X := \Lambda^0 \cup \Lambda^{\neq 0} \cup G(\Lambda^{\neq 0})$ and $\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))$ be the free algebra on the set of words on X. Let I be the ideal of $\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))$ generated by elements from the sets:

(i) $\{vw - \delta_{v,w}v : v, w \in \Lambda^0\}$,
(ii) $\{\lambda - \mu\nu, \lambda^* - \nu^*\mu^* : \lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Lambda^{\neq 0}$ an $\lambda = \mu\nu\}$,
(iii) $\{\lambda - r(\lambda)\lambda, \lambda - \lambda s(\lambda), \lambda^* - s(\lambda)\lambda^*, \lambda^* - \lambda^* r(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda^{\neq 0}\}$,
(iv) $\{\lambda^*\mu - \delta_{\lambda,\mu}s(\lambda) : \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\leq n}, n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}\}$,
(v) $\{v - \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{\leq n}} \lambda\lambda^* : v \in \Lambda^0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}\}$.

Set $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) := \mathbb{F}_R(w(X))/I$, and write $q : \mathbb{F}_R(w(X)) \to \mathbb{F}_R(w(X))/I$ for the quotient map. Define $p : \Lambda^0 \to \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ by $p_v = q(v)$, and $s : \Lambda^{\neq 0} \cup G(\Lambda^{\neq 0}) \to KP_R(\Lambda)$ by $s_\lambda = q(\lambda)$ and $s_{\lambda^*} = q(\lambda^*)$. Then (p, s) is a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in the R-algebra $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$.

Now let (Q, T) be a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in an R-algebra A. Define $f : X \to A$ by $f(v) = Q_v$, $f(\lambda) = T_\lambda$ and $f(\lambda^*) = T_{\lambda^*}$. The universal property of $\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))$ gives a unique R-algebra homomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{F}_R(w(X)) \to A$ such that $\psi|_X = f$. Since (Q, T) is a Kumjian-Pask family, $I \subseteq \ker(\psi)$. Thus there exists a unique R-algebra homomorphism $\pi_{Q,T} : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) \to A$ such that $\pi_{Q,T} \circ q = \psi$. It follows that $\pi_{Q,T} \circ p = Q$ and $\pi_{Q,T} \circ s = T$.

Now fix $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \Lambda^0$. If rp_v were zero then $r\pi_{Q,T}(p_v) = rQ_v$ would be zero for every Kumjian-Pask Λ-family (Q, T). But this is not the case for the Kumjian-Pask family of Proposition 3.6. Thus $rp_v \neq 0$. This completes the proof of (a).

For (b), extend the degree map to words on X by setting $d : w(X) \to \mathbb{Z}^k$ by $d(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{|w|} d(w_i)$. By [8, Proposition 2.7], $\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))$ is graded over $\mathbb{Z}^k$ by the subgroups

$$\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))_n := \Big\{ \sum_{w \in w(X)} r_w w : r_w \neq 0 \implies d(w) = n \Big\}.$$

We claim that the ideal I defined in the proof of (a) is graded. For this, it suffices to see that I is generated by homogeneous elements, that is, elements in $\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^k$. The generators of I in (i) are a linear combination of words of degree 0, hence are homogeneous of degree 0. If $\lambda = \mu\nu$ in Λ then $\lambda - \mu\nu$ is a linear combination of words of degree $d(\lambda)$, so all the generators in (ii) are homogeneous. Also, $\lambda - r(\lambda)\lambda$ is homogeneous of degree λ, and similarly all the generators in (iii) are homogeneous of some degree[1]. The elements in (iv) are either of the form $\lambda^*\lambda - s(\lambda)$ or of the form $\lambda^*\mu$; the former is homogeneous of degree 0 and the latter is homogeneous of degree $d(\mu) - d(\lambda)$. A word $\lambda\lambda^*$ has degree 0, and hence the generators in (v) are homogeneous of degree 0. Thus I is a graded ideal.

---

[1] This has caused some confusion before: for example in [29, Proof of Proposition 4.7], $e - r(e)e$ for an edge e in a graph is claimed to be 0-graded whereas it is 1-graded.

Since I is graded, the quotient $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ of $\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))$ by I is graded by the subgroups

$$(\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))/I)_n := \operatorname{span}\{q(w) : w \in w(X), d(w) = n\}.$$

By Corollary 3.4, $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) = \operatorname{span}\{s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \Lambda, s(\alpha) = s(\beta)\}$. We need to show that

$$\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_n := \operatorname{span}\{s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} : d(\alpha) - d(\beta) = n\} = (\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))/I)_n.$$

First, fix $s_\lambda s_{\mu^*} \in \{s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} : d(\alpha) - d(\beta) = n\}$. Then $s_\lambda s_{\mu^*} = q(\lambda)q(\mu^*) = q(\lambda\mu^*)$, and $d(\lambda\mu^*) = d(\lambda) - d(\mu) = n$. Thus $s_\lambda s_\mu^* \in \{q(w) : d(w) = n, w \in w(X)\} \in (\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))/I)_n$.

That $(\mathbb{F}_R(w(X))/I)_n \subseteq \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_n$ follows immediately from the next lemma; the proof is very similar to that of [8, Lemma 3.5], but we need to check replacing Λ^n by $\Lambda^{\leq n}$ in the argument does not cause problems. □

Lemma 3.8. *For every $w \in w(X)$, we have $q(w) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $|w|$. We treat the cases $|w| = 1, 2$ separately. Recall that by our convention $s_v := p_v$ and $s_{v^*} := p_v$ for $v \in \Lambda^0$.

If $|w| = 1$ there are two possibilities. If $w = \lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then $q(w) = s_\lambda = s_\lambda s_{s(\lambda)^*}$ and $d(\lambda) - d(s(\lambda)) = d(\lambda)$, and so $q(w) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$. Otherwise, if $w = \lambda^*$, then $q(w) = s_{\lambda^*} = s_{s(\lambda)} s_{\lambda^*}$ and $d(s(\lambda)) - d(\lambda) = d(\lambda^*)$, so $q(w) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$.

If $|w| = 2$ there are four possibilities: $w = \lambda\mu^*, \lambda\mu, \mu^*\lambda^*$ or $\lambda^*\mu$. The first three possibilities are quickly dealt with since

$$\begin{aligned}
&q(\lambda\mu^*) = s_\lambda s_{\mu^*} \text{ and } d(\lambda) - d(\mu) = d(\lambda\mu^*),\\
&q(\lambda\mu) = s_{\lambda\mu} s_{s(\mu)^*} \text{ and } d(\lambda\mu) - d(s(\mu)) = d(\lambda\mu),\\
&q(\mu^*\lambda^*) = s_{s(\mu)} s_{(\lambda\mu)^*} \text{ and } d(s(\mu)) - d((\lambda\mu)^*) = d(\mu^*\lambda^*).
\end{aligned}$$

So suppose $w = \lambda^*\mu$. Let $m = d(\mu) \vee d(\lambda)$. By Proposition 3.3 we have

$$q(\lambda^*\mu) = s_{\lambda^*} s_\mu = \sum_{\lambda\alpha = \mu\beta, \lambda\alpha \in \Lambda^{\leq m}} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*}.$$

In each summand, $\lambda\alpha = \mu\beta$ implies $d(w) = d(\mu) - d(\lambda) = d(\alpha) - d(\beta)$, so $q(w) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$ as needed.

Now let $n \geq 2$ and suppose that $q(y) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(y)}$ for every word y with $|y| \leq n$. Let w be a word with $|w| = n + 1$ and $q(w) \neq 0$. If w contains a subword $w_i w_{i+1} = \lambda\mu$, then λ and μ are composable in Λ since otherwise $q(\lambda\mu) = 0$. Let w' be the word obtained from w by replacing $w_i w_{i+1}$ with the single path $\lambda\mu$. Then

$$q(w) = s_{w_1} \cdots s_{w_{i-1}} s_\lambda s_\mu s_{w_{i+2}} \cdots s_{w_{n+1}} = s_{w_1} \cdots s_{w_{i-1}} s_{\lambda\mu} s_{w_{i+2}} \cdots s_{w_{n+1}} = q(w').$$

Since $|w'| = n$ and $d(w') = d(w)$, the inductive hypothesis implies that $q(w) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$. A similar argument shows that $q(w) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$ whenever w contains a subword $w_i w_{i+1} = \lambda^*\mu^*$.

If w contains no subword of the form $\lambda\mu$ or $\lambda^*\mu^*$, then, since $|w| \geq 3$, it must have a subword of the form $\lambda^*\mu$. By Proposition 3.3 we write $q(w)$ as a sum of terms $q(y^i)$ with $|y^i| = n + 1$ and $d(y^i) = d(w)$. Since $|w| \geq 3$, each nonzero summand $q(y^i)$ contains a factor of the form $s_{\beta^*} s_{\gamma^*}$ or one of the form $s_\delta s_\alpha$, and the argument above shows that every $q(y^i) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$. Thus $q(w) \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)_{d(w)}$ as well. □

4. The uniqueness theorems

Throughout this section, Λ is a locally convex, row-finite k-graph, and R is a commutative ring with 1.

There are two uniqueness theorems in the subject. The graded-uniqueness theorem has no hypotheses on the graph, so applies very generally. The Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem assumes the graph satisfies an "aperiodicity" condition. The proofs of both theorems are straightforward once key helper-results (Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.6) have been established.

Theorem 4.1 (The graded-uniqueness theorem)**.** *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. Suppose that A is a $\mathbb{Z}^k$-graded R-algebra and $\phi : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) \to A$ is a graded R-algebra homomorphism. If $\phi(rp_v) \neq 0$ for all $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \Lambda^0$, then ϕ is injective.*

Theorem 4.2 (The Cuntz-Krieger uniqueness theorem)**.** *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph satisfying the aperiodicity condition*

$$\text{for every } v \in \Lambda^0\text{, there exists } x \in v\Lambda^{\leq\infty} \text{ such that } \alpha \neq \beta \text{ implies } \alpha x \neq \beta x. \tag{4.1}$$

Let $\phi : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) \to A$ be an R-algebra homomorphism into an R-algebra A. If $\phi(rp_v) \neq 0$ for all $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \Lambda^0$, then ϕ is injective.

The aperiodicity condition (4.1) we have chosen to use is from [20, Theorem 4.3], is often called 'condition B' in the literature, and generalises the many notions of 'aperiodicity' for graphs without sources. See Lemma 8.4 below for more details.

We start by establishing that every nonzero element of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ can be written in a certain form; this form differs from the one for graphs without sources only in the use of $\Lambda^{\leq n}$ in place of Λ^q.

Lemma 4.3. *Every nonzero $a \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ can be written in normal form: that is, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$ and a finite subset F of $\Lambda \times \Lambda^{\leq n}$ such that*

$$a = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in F} r_{\alpha,\beta} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*}$$

where $r_{\alpha,\beta} \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$ for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in F$.

Proof. Let $0 \neq a \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. By Corollary 3.4 we can write a as a finite sum

$$a = \sum_{(\mu,\nu)\in G} r_{\mu,\nu} s_\mu s_{\nu^*},$$

where $G \subseteq \Lambda \times \Lambda$, $s(\mu) = s(\nu)$ and each $r_{\mu,\nu} \neq 0$ in R. Let $n = \vee_{(\mu,\nu)\in G} d(\nu)$. Consider $(\mu, \nu) \in G$ such that $d(\nu) < n$. Then, using (KP2) and (KP4′), we get

$$s_\mu s_{\nu^*} = s_\mu p_{s(\mu)} s_{\nu^*} = s_\mu \Big(\sum_{\lambda \in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\nu)}} s_\lambda s_{\lambda^*} \Big) s_{\nu*} = \sum_{\lambda \in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq n-d(\nu)}} s_{\mu\lambda} s_{(\nu\lambda)^*}.$$

Substituting back into the expression for a and combining terms gives the result. ☐

Next we generalise [11, Lemma 2.3(1)] to graphs with possible sources.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $0 \neq a = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in F} r_{\alpha,\beta} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ be in normal form. For all $(\mu,\nu) \in F$,*

$$0 \neq s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)} + \sum_{(\alpha,\nu)\in F, d(\alpha)\neq d(\mu)} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha, \tag{4.2}$$

and $r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}$ is the 0-graded component of $s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu$.

Proof. Since a is in normal form, $F \subseteq \Lambda \times \Lambda^{\leq n}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^k \setminus \{0\}$. Fix $(\mu,\nu) \in F$. For all $(\alpha,\beta) \in F$, both β and $\nu \in \Lambda^{\leq n}$, and hence (KP3′) gives $s_{\beta^*} s_\nu = \delta_{\beta,\nu} p_{s(\nu)}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu &= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in F} r_{\alpha,\beta} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} s_\nu = \sum_{(\alpha,\nu)\in F} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha p_{s(\nu)} \\ &= r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)} + \sum_{(\alpha,\nu)\in F, \alpha\neq\mu} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha \end{aligned}$$

by (KP2) since $(\alpha,\nu) \in F$ implies $s(\alpha) = s(\nu)$. If there exists α such that $(\alpha,\nu) \in F$, $\alpha \neq \mu$ and $d(\alpha) = d(\mu)$, then (KP3′) implies that $s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha = 0$. Thus

$$s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)} + \sum_{(\alpha,\nu)\in F, d(\alpha)\neq d(\mu)} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha.$$

It now follows that the 0-graded component of $s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu$ is $r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}$, which is nonzero by Theorem 3.7(a). Now $s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu$ is nonzero because its 0-graded component is. ☐

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $0 \neq a \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. Write $a = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in F} r_{\alpha,\beta} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*}$ in normal form. Let $(\mu,\nu) \in F$. By Lemma 4.4,

$$0 \neq s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)} + \sum_{(\alpha,\nu)\in F, d(\alpha)\neq d(\mu)} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha$$

with 0-graded component $r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}$. Since ϕ is graded, $\phi(r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)})$ is the 0-graded component of $\phi(s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu)$. Now $\phi(s_{\mu^*})\phi(a)\phi(s_\nu) = \phi(s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu) \neq 0$ because its 0-graded component $\phi(r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}) \neq 0$ by assumption. It follows that $\phi(a) \neq 0$ as well. Thus ϕ is injective. ☐

One immediate application of the Theorem 4.1 is:

Proposition 4.5. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. Then $\mathrm{KP}_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$ is isomorphic to a dense subalgebra of $C^*(\Lambda)$.*

Proof. Let (q,t) be a generating Cuntz-Krieger Λ-family in $C^*(\Lambda)$ as in [20, Definition 3.3]. Then (q,t) is a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in $C^*(\Lambda)$. (To see this, recall from page 4 that (KP1) and (KP2) hold, (KP4′) and (CK4) are the same and (KP3′) and (CK3) are the same via Corollary 3.5.) Thus the universal property of $\mathrm{KP}_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$ of Theorem 3.7 gives a homomorphism $\pi_{q,t}$ from $\mathrm{KP}_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$ onto the dense subalgebra

$$A := \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_\mu^* : \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda\}$$

of $C^*(\Lambda)$. To show that $\pi_{q,t}$ is injective, we will use the gauge-invariant uniqueness theorem, Theorem 4.1. Consider the subgroups

$$A_n := \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_\mu^* : d(\lambda) - d(\mu) = n\} \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^k)$$

of A. A calculation using Corollary 3.5 shows that $A_n A_m \subseteq A_{n+m}$. Since each spanning element $t_\mu t_\nu^*$ of A belongs to $A_{d(\lambda)-d(\mu)}$, every element a of A can be written as a finite sum $\sum a_n$ with $a_n \in A_n$. If $a_n \in A_n$ and a finite sum $\sum a_n = 0$, then each $a_n = 0$ by the argument of the proof of [8, Lemma 7.4], which uses the gauge action of $\mathbb{T}^k$ on $C^*(\Lambda)$. Thus $\{A_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}^k\}$ is a grading of A. It follows that $\pi_{q,t}$ is graded and hence is injective by Theorem 4.1. □

Proposition 4.6. *Let* Λ *be a locally convex, row-finite* k*-graph satisfying the aperiodicity condition* (4.1)*. Suppose* $0 \neq a = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in F} r_{\alpha,\beta} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ *is in normal form. Let* $(\mu,\nu) \in F$*. Then there exist* $\sigma, \tau \in \Lambda$ *such that* $s_{\sigma^*} a s_\tau = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}$*.*

Proof. Let $(\mu,\nu) \in F$. By Lemma 4.4,

$$0 \neq s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)} + \sum_{(\alpha,\nu)\in F, d(\alpha)\neq d(\mu)} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha. \tag{4.3}$$

If $G := \{\alpha : (\alpha,\nu) \in F, d(\alpha) \neq d(\mu)\} = \emptyset$ then we can take $\sigma = \mu$ and $\tau = \nu$, and we are done. So suppose $G \neq \emptyset$.

Choose $y \in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ such that (4.1) holds. Then for each $\alpha \in G$, $\alpha y \neq \mu y$. So there exists $m_\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $(\alpha y)(0, m_\alpha) \neq (\mu y)(0, m_\alpha)$. Let $m := \bigvee_{\alpha\in G} m_\alpha$. For later use we note that since $m_\alpha \leq d(y) + d(\alpha)$, taking the meet of both sides with m we get

$$m_\alpha = m \wedge m_\alpha \leq m \wedge (d(y) + d(\alpha)) \leq m \wedge d(y) + d(\alpha);$$

the same argument gives $m_\alpha \leq m \wedge d(y) + d(\mu)$.

We would like to use $y(0,m)$ now, but since y is a boundary path this may not be well-defined, so we will use $y(0, m \wedge d(y))$ instead. Then, using (4.3),

$$\begin{aligned} &s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))^*}(s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu) s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))} \\ &\qquad = r_{\mu,\nu} s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))^*} p_{s(\mu)} s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))} + \sum_{\alpha\in G} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))^*} s_{\mu^*} s_\alpha s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))} \\ &\qquad = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)} + \sum_{\{\alpha\in G : \alpha\neq\mu\}} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{(\mu y(0,m\wedge d(y)))^*} s_{\alpha y(0,m\wedge d(y))} \end{aligned}$$

because $r(y) = s(\mu)$ and (KP2), and then (KP3), all on the first summand. After composing paths this

$$= r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)} + \sum_{\alpha\in G} r_{\alpha,\nu} s_{(\mu y)(0,m\wedge d(y)+d(\mu))^*} s_{(\alpha y)(0,m\wedge d(y)+d(\alpha))}.$$

We claim that for every $\alpha \in G$, $s_{(\mu y)(0,m\wedge d(y)+d(\mu))^*} s_{(\alpha y)(0,m\wedge d(y)+d(\alpha))} = 0$. To see this, by way of contradiction, suppose there exists $\alpha \in G$ such that

$$s_{(\mu y)(0,m\wedge d(y)+d(\mu))^*} s_{(\alpha y)(0,m\wedge d(y)+d(\alpha))} \neq 0.$$

Since $m_\alpha \leq m \wedge d(y) + d(\mu)$ and $m_\alpha \leq m \wedge d(y) + d(\alpha)$ we must have $s_{(\mu y)(0,m_\alpha)^*} s_{(\alpha y)(0,m_\alpha)} \neq 0$. But $(\mu y)(0, m_\alpha)$ and $(\alpha y)(0, m_\alpha) \in \Lambda^{\leq m_\alpha}$, and hence $(\mu y)(0, m_\alpha) = (\alpha y)(0, m_\alpha)$ by (KP3′), contradicting our choice of m_α. This proves the claim. Therefore

$$s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))^*}(s_{\mu^*} a s_\nu) s_{y(0,m\wedge d(y))} = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}.$$

The proposition follows with $\sigma := \mu y(0, m \wedge d(y))$ and $\tau := \nu y(0, m \wedge d(y))$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let $0 \neq a \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. Write $a = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in F} r_{\alpha,\beta} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*}$ in normal form. Fix $(\mu,\nu) \in F$. Since Λ satisfies the aperiodicity condition (4.1), by Proposition 4.6 there exist $\sigma, \tau \in \Lambda$ such that $s_\sigma^* a s_\tau = r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}$. Now $\phi(s_\sigma^*)\phi(a)\phi(s_\tau) = \phi(s_\sigma^* a s_\tau) = \phi(r_{\mu,\nu} p_{s(\mu)}) \neq 0$ by assumption, and hence $\phi(a) \neq 0$ as well. Thus ϕ is injective. □

5. Examples of 2-graphs with sources and applications to rank-2 Bratteli diagrams

Throughout this section, R is a commutative ring with 1. Let Λ be a 2-graph. We refer to the morphisms of degree $(n_1, 0)$ as blue paths, to the morphisms of degree $(0, n_2)$ as red paths, and write Λ^{blue} and Λ^{red} for the collection of blue and red paths, respectively. We say a path $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $d(\lambda) \neq 0$ is a *cycle* if $r(\lambda) = s(\lambda)$ and for $0 < n < d(\lambda)$, $\lambda(n) \neq s(\lambda)$. We say a cycle λ is *isolated* if for every $0 < n \leq d(\lambda)$, the sets

$$r(\lambda)\Lambda^n \setminus \{\lambda(0, n)\} \text{ and } s(\lambda)\Lambda^n \setminus \{\lambda(d(\lambda) - n, d(\lambda))\}$$

are empty.

Proposition 5.1. *Let Λ be a finite 2-graph such that*

(5.1) Λ^{blue} *contains no cycles and each vertex $v \in \Lambda^0$ is the range of an isolated cycle in Λ^{red}.*

Let S be the set of sources in Λ^{blue}. Suppose the vertices in S all lie on a single isolated cycle in Λ^{red}. Let Y denote the set $\Lambda^{\text{blue}}S$ of blue paths with source in S. Then $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is isomorphic to $M_Y(R[x, x^{-1}])$, where $R[x, x^{-1}]$ is the ring of Laurent polynomials over R.

Any graph satisfying (5.1) is locally convex [19, page 141]. Proposition 5.1 is very similar to Proposition 3.5 of [19], which, with the same hypotheses on Λ and $R = \mathbb{C}$, gives an isomorphism of $C^*(\Lambda)$ onto $M_Y(C(\mathbb{T})) \cong M_Y(\mathbb{C}) \otimes C(\mathbb{T})$. The proof of [19, Proposition 3.5] finds a family $\{\theta(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha, \beta \in Y\}$ of matrix units and a unitary U in $C^*(\Lambda)$ such that $\theta(\alpha, \beta)U = U\theta(\alpha, \beta)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in Y$. This gives a homomorphism $\phi : M_Y(\mathbb{C}) \otimes C(\mathbb{T})$ into $C^*(\Lambda)$. The argument then shows that U has full spectrum, from which it follows that ϕ is injective, and then ϕ is shown to be surjective. Since R is a ring with 1, the matrix units $\{\theta(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha, \beta \in Y\}$ (and the unitary U) live naturally in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. But in the algebraic setting, the spectral argument is not available; we use the following lemma instead.

Lemma 5.2. *Let W be a ring with 1 where W contains a set $\{\theta(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha, \beta \in Y\}$ of matrix units. Let $\alpha_0 \in Y$ and $D := \theta(\alpha_0, \alpha_0)W\theta(\alpha_0, \alpha_0)$. Then the map $w \mapsto (\theta(\alpha_0, \alpha)w\theta(\beta, \alpha_0))_{\alpha,\beta}$ is an isomorphism of W onto $M_Y(D)$.*

The proof of Lemma 5.2 is straightforward, see, for example, [25, Proposition 13.9]. In the proof of Proposition 5.1 we will apply Lemma 5.2 with $\theta(\alpha_0, \alpha_0) = p_\dagger$, where $\dagger$ is a vertex in the set S of sources in Λ^{blue}.

Lemma 5.3. *Let Λ be a 2-graph satisfying the hypotheses of Proposition 5.1. Fix a vertex $\dagger \in S$ and let μ be the unique red path of least nonzero degree with range and source $\dagger$. Then there is an isomorphism of $R[x, x^{-1}]$ onto $p_\dagger \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)p_\dagger$ such that $1 \mapsto p_\dagger$, $x \mapsto s_\mu$ and $x^{-1} \mapsto s_{\mu^*}$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$ with $r(\alpha) = \dagger$. Then $\alpha \in \Lambda^{\text{red}}$. Let ν be the unique red path of nonzero least length n_2 such that $s(\alpha\nu) = \dagger$. For any β, applying (KP4′) to $s_\alpha s_{\beta^*}$ gives

$$s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} = s_\alpha p_{s(\alpha)} s_{\beta^*} = s_\alpha \sum_{\lambda \in s(\alpha)\Lambda^{\leq(0,n_2)}} s_\lambda s_{\lambda^*} s_{\beta^*} = s_{\alpha\nu} s_{(\beta\nu)^*}. \tag{5.2}$$

The Kumjian-Pask relation (KP4$'$) at $\dagger$ with $n = |\mu| e_2$ says that $s_\mu s_{\mu^*} = p_\dagger$. Writing μ^i for the path which traverses μ exactly i times, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} p_\dagger \operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda) p_\dagger &= \operatorname{span}\{s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \Lambda^{\mathrm{red}}, s(\alpha) = s(\beta), r(\alpha) = r(\beta) = \dagger\} \\ &= \operatorname{span}\{s_{\mu^i} s_{(\mu^j)^*} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}\} \quad \text{(using (5.2))} \\ &= \operatorname{span}\{s_{\mu^i}, s_{(\mu^i)^*} : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \quad (\text{since } s_\mu s_{\mu^*} = p_\dagger). \end{aligned}$$

Now let E be the directed graph with one vertex w and one edge f. Let $L_R(E)$ be the Leavitt path algebra over R, and let $\{q_w, t_f, t_{f^*}\}$ be the generating Leavitt E-family in $L_R(E)$. The polynomials $\{1, x, x^{-1}\}$ are a Leavitt E-family in $R[x, x^{-1}]$, and the universal property of $L_R(E)$ gives an R-algebra homomorphism $\rho : L_R(E) \to R[x, x^{-1}]$ such that $\rho(1) = q_w$, $\rho(t_f) = x$ and $\rho(t_{f^*}) = x^{-1}$. Now ρ is surjective because the range of ρ contains the generators x and x^{-1} of $R[x, x^{-1}]$, and it is one-to-one by definition of the zero polynomial.

Since $p_\dagger = s_\mu s_{\mu^*}$, it follows that $\{p_\dagger, s_\mu, s_{\mu^*}\}$ is a Leavitt E-family in $\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. By the universal property of $L_R(E)$ again, there is an R-algebra homomorphism $\pi : L_R(E) \to \operatorname{KP}_R(E)$ such that $\pi(q_w) = p_\dagger$, $\pi(t_f) = s_\mu$ and $\pi(t_{f^*}) = s_{\mu^*}$. Now we observe that $p_\dagger \operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda) p_\dagger = \operatorname{span}\{s_{\mu^i}, s_{(\mu^i)^*} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is graded over $\mathbb{Z}$ by the subgroups $\operatorname{span}\{s_{\mu^i}\}$. Thus π is graded, and hence it is injective by the graded-uniqueness theorem [29, Theorem 5.3].

Now $\pi \circ \rho^{-1} : R[x, x^{-1}] \to \operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is injective and satisfies

$$\pi \circ \rho^{-1}(1) = p_\dagger, \pi \circ \rho^{-1}(x) = s_\mu \text{ and } \pi \circ \rho^{-1}(x^{-1}) = s_{\mu^*}.$$

It follows that $\pi \circ \rho^{-1}$ has range $\operatorname{span}\{s_{\mu^i}, s_{(\mu^i)^*} : i \in \mathbb{N}\} = p_\dagger \operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda) p_\dagger$. Thus $\pi \circ \rho^{-1}$ is the required isomorphism. □

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Fix a vertex $\dagger \in S$ and let $e_\dagger$ be the edge in $S\Lambda^{\mathrm{red}}S$ with $r(e_\dagger) = \dagger$. For α, β in Y, let $\nu(\alpha, \beta)$ be the unique path in Λ^{red} connecting $s(\alpha)$ and $s(\beta)$ such that $\nu(\alpha, \beta)$ does not contain $e_\dagger$. It follows from the proof of Lemma 3.8 of [19], that the elements

$$\theta(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} s_\alpha s_{\nu(\alpha,\beta)} s_{\beta^*} & \text{if } s(\nu(\alpha, \beta)) = s(\beta); \\ s_\alpha s_{\nu(\alpha,\beta)^*} s_{\beta^*} & \text{if } s(\nu(\alpha, \beta)) = s(\alpha) \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

form a set $\{\theta(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha, \beta \in Y\}$ of matrix units in $\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda)$, that is, $\theta(\alpha, \beta)\theta(\sigma, \tau) = \delta_{\beta,\sigma}\theta(\alpha, \tau)$. Since Λ^0 is finite, there exists n_1 such that $Y = \Lambda^{\leq(n_1,0)}$. Calculate:

$$\sum_{\alpha \in Y} \theta(\alpha, \alpha) = \sum_{\alpha \in Y} s_\alpha s_{\alpha^*} = \sum_{v \in \Lambda^0} \sum_{\alpha \in vY} s_\alpha s_{\alpha^*} = \sum_{v \in \Lambda^0} \sum_{\alpha \in v\Lambda^{\leq(n_1,0)}} s_\alpha s_{\alpha^*} = \sum_{v \in \Lambda^0} p_v = 1.$$

Let $\alpha_0 = \dagger$. Then α_0 is a path of degree 0 in Y, and $\theta(\alpha_0, \alpha_0) = p_\dagger$. Now apply Lemma 5.2 with $\alpha_0 = \dagger$ to see that $\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is isomorphic to $M_Y(p_\dagger \operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda) p_\dagger)$. The proposition now follows from the isomorphism of $p_\dagger \operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda) p_\dagger$ with $R[x, x^{-1}]$ of Lemma 5.3 □

5.1. **Application to rank-2 Bratteli diagrams.** Throughout this subsection, Λ is a row-finite 2-graph without sources which is a rank-2 Bratteli diagram in the sense of [19, Definition 4.1]. This means that the blue subgraph Λ^{blue} of paths of degree $(n_1, 0)$ is a Bratteli diagram in the usual sense: the vertex set Λ^0 is the disjoint union $\bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} V_n$ of finite subsets V_n, each blue edge goes from some V_{n+1} to V_n. The red subgraph Λ^{red} of paths of degree $(0, n_2)$ consists of disjoint cycles whose vertices lie entirely in some V_n. For each blue edge e there is a unique red edge f with $s(f) = r(e)$, and hence by the factorization property there is a unique blue-red path $\mathcal{F}(e)h$ such that $\mathcal{F}(e)h = fe$. The map $\mathcal{F} : \Lambda^{e_1} \to \Lambda^{e_1}$ is a bijection, and induces a permutation of each finite set $\Lambda^{e_1}V_n$. We write $o(e)$ for the order of e: the smallest $l > 0$ such that $\mathcal{F}^l(e) = e$.

A k-graph without sources is *cofinal* if for every $x \in \Lambda^\infty$ and every $v \in \Lambda^0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $v\Lambda x(n) \neq \emptyset$. It follows from [19, Theorem 5.1] that if Λ is cofinal and $\{o(e)\}$ is unbounded, then Λ is aperiodic; and hence if K is a field, then $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)$ is simple by [8, Corollary 7.8]. So the rank-2 Bratteli diagrams give a rich supply of simple Kumjian-Pask algebras.

Theorem 7.10 of [8] uses rank-2 Bratteli diagrams to show that there are simple Kumjian-Pask algebras that are neither purely infinite nor locally matricial. But the analysis in §7 of [8] specialises to $K = \mathbb{C}$ because the proof reduces to a "rank-2 Bratteli diagrams Λ_N of depth N", which is a 2-graph with sources. In the absence of a Kumjian-Pask algebra for such graphs, the embedding into $C^*(\Lambda_N)$ is used. This was one of our motivations for defining a Kumjian-Pask algebra for graphs with sources in the first place, and we now show that we can extend [8, Theorem 7.10] from $\mathbb{C}$ to arbitrary fields K (see Theorem 5.8 below). Note that we will use the letter K in place of R when we are explicitly assuming the underlying ring is a field. We start with three lemmas.

Lemma 5.4. *Let Λ be a rank-2 Bratteli diagram. Let Λ_N be the rank-2 Bratteli diagram of depth N consisting of all the paths in Λ which begin and end in $\bigcup_{n=0}^N V_n$. Then Λ_N is locally convex and the subalgebra* $\operatorname{span}\{s_\mu s_{\nu^*} : \mu, \nu \in \Lambda_N\}$ *of* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ *is canonically isomorphic to* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)$.

Proof. The graph Λ_N has sources, but satisfies (5.1), and hence is locally convex [19, page 141]. For $v \in \Lambda_N^0$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda_N$, set $Q_v = p_v$, $T_\lambda = s_\lambda$ and $T_{\lambda^*} = s_{\lambda^*}$. We will show that (Q, T) is a Kumjian-Pask Λ_N-family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. Both (KP1) and (KP2) for (Q, T) immediately reduce to (KP1) and (KP2) for the Λ-family (p, s).

For (KP3′), let $n \in \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_N^{\leq n}$. Since

$$T_{\lambda^*}T_\mu = T_{\lambda^*}Q_{r(\lambda)}Q_{r(\mu)}T_\mu = \delta_{r(\lambda),r(\mu)}T_{\lambda^*}T_\mu,$$

if $r(\lambda) \neq r(\mu)$, then $T_{\lambda^*}T_\mu = 0 = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}Q_{s(\mu)}$. So we may assume that $r(\lambda) = r(\mu)$.

Notice that $d(\lambda)_2 = d(\mu)_2 = n_2$ because $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\leq n}$ and the red subgraph consists entirely of cycles and hence has no sources. We claim that $d(\lambda)_1 = d(\mu)_1$. By way of contradiction, suppose $d(\lambda)_1 < d(\mu)_1 \leq n_1$. Since $r(\lambda) = r(\mu)$, we must have $s(\lambda) \in V_i$ and $s(\mu) \in V_j$ where $i < j$. Thus $s(\lambda) \notin V_N$. But $s(\lambda)$ must be a source in the blue graph because $d(\lambda) < n$. This implies $s(\lambda) \in V_N$, a contradiction. Similarly, we cannot have $d(\mu)_1 < d(\lambda)_1$. Thus $d(\lambda) = d(\mu)$ as claimed.

Now $\lambda, \mu \in r(\lambda)\Lambda^{d(\lambda)}$, and $T_{\lambda^*}T_\mu = s_{\lambda^*}s_\mu = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}p_{s(\mu)} = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}Q_{s(\mu)}$ by (KP3) for (p, s). Thus (KP3′) holds for (Q, T).

To see (KP4′) holds, we use Lemma 3.2. Let $v \in \Lambda_N^0$ and suppose that $v\Lambda_N^{e_i} \neq \emptyset$. If $v \in \Lambda_N^0 \setminus V_N$, then $i = 1$ or 2, and if $v \in V_N$, then $i = 2$. In both cases, (KP4) for (q, t) gives

$$Q_v = p_v = \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}} s_\lambda s_{\lambda^*} = \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda_N^{e_i}} s_\lambda s_{\lambda^*}.$$

Thus (KP4′) holds by Lemma 3.2.

Denote the generating Kumjian-Pask Λ_N-family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)$ by (q, t). The universal property of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)$ (Theorem 3.7(a)) now gives a homomorphism $\pi_{Q,T} : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N) \to$

$\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ such that $\pi_{Q,T}(q_v)=p_v$, $\pi_{Q,T}(t_\lambda)=s_\lambda$ and $\pi_{Q,T}(t_{\lambda^*})=s_{\lambda^*}$. Thus $\pi_{Q,T}$ has range $\operatorname{span}\{s_\mu s_{\nu^*}:\mu,\nu\in\Lambda_N\}$. It is clear that $\pi_{Q,T}$ is graded. Since each $\pi_{Q,T}(q_v)\neq 0$, it follows from the graded-uniqueness theorem (Theorem 4.1) that $\pi_{Q,T}$ is injective. ☐

Lemma 5.5. *Let Λ_N be a rank-2 Bratteli diagram of depth N. Let $V_{N,i}$ be the vertices in V_N of one isolated red cycle, and let $\Lambda_{N,i}$ be the subgraph of Λ_N of paths with source and range in $V:=\{v\in\Lambda^0 : v\Lambda V_{N,i}\neq\emptyset\}$. Let (q,t) be a generating Kumjian-Pask Λ_N family in $\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)$. Then the subalgebra*

$$C_{n,i}:=\operatorname{span}\{t_\mu t_{\nu^*}:\mu,\nu\in\Lambda_N,\, s(\mu)=s(\nu)\in V_{N,i}\}$$

of $\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)$ is canonically isomorphic to $\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda_{N,i})$.

Proof. Set $P_i=\sum_{\alpha\in\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_\alpha t_{\alpha^*}$. Let $v\in\Lambda^0_{N,i}$ and $\mu\in\Lambda_{N,i}$. Set

$$Q_v=P_iq_vP_i,\, T_\mu=P_it_\mu P_i \text{and } T_{\mu^*}=P_it_{\mu^*}P_i.$$

We will show that (Q,T) is a Kumjian-Pask $\Lambda_{N,i}$-family in $C_{N,i}$.

If $\alpha,\beta\in v\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}$, then $d(\alpha)=d(\beta)$ because Λ^{blue} is a Calibrate diagram. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}P_i^2&=\sum_{v,w\in V}\sum_{\alpha\in v\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}}\sum_{\beta\in w\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_\alpha t_{\alpha^*}q_vq_wt_\beta t_{\beta^*}=\sum_{v\in V}\sum_{\alpha,\beta\in v\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_\alpha t_{\alpha^*}t_\beta t_{\beta^*}\\ &=\sum_{v\in V}\sum_{\alpha\in v\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_\alpha t_{\alpha^*}t_\alpha t_{\alpha^*}=P_i.\end{aligned}$$

We also have $q_vP_i=\sum_{\alpha\in v\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_\alpha t_\alpha^*=P_iq_v$, and

$$\begin{aligned}P_it_\mu P_i&=\sum_{\alpha,\beta\in\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_\alpha t_{\alpha^*}t_\mu t_\beta t_{\beta^*}=\sum_{\alpha\in r(\mu)\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}}\sum_{\beta\in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_\alpha t_{\alpha^*}t_{\mu\beta}t_{\beta^*}\\ &=\sum_{\beta\in s(\mu)\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_{N,i}} t_{\mu\beta}t_{\beta^*}\quad\text{(by KP3}'\text{ because such }\alpha\text{ must have the same degree as }\mu\beta)\\ &=t_\mu P_i.\end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation gives $P_it_{\mu^*}P_i=P_it_{\mu^*}$. The above relations help to reduce the Kumjian-Pask relations for (Q,T) to the Kumjian-Pask relations for (q,t) in $\operatorname{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)$.

To see (KP1) holds, let $v,w\in\Lambda^0_{N,i}$. Then

$$Q_vQ_w=P_iq_vP_i^2q_wP_i=P_i^3q_vq_wP_i=\delta_{v,w}P_iq_vP_i=\delta_{v,w}Q_v.$$

To see (KP2) holds, let $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_{N,i}$. Then

$$T_\lambda T_\mu=P_it_\lambda P_i^2t_\mu P_i=P_it_\lambda t_\mu P_i=P_it_{\lambda\mu}P_i=T_{\lambda\mu},$$

and, similarly, $T_{\mu^*}T_{\lambda^*}=T_{(\lambda\mu)^*}$. To see (KP3′) holds, let $n\in\mathbb{N}^2\setminus\{0\}$ and $\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda^{\leq n}_{N,i}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}T_{\lambda^*}T_\mu&=P_it_{\lambda^*}P_it_\mu P_i=P_it_{\lambda^*}t_\mu P_i\\ &=\delta_{\lambda,\mu}P_iq_{s(\mu)}P_i\quad(\text{because }\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda^{\leq n}_N)\\ &=\delta_{\lambda,\mu}Q_{s(\mu)}.\end{aligned}$$

To see (KP4$'$) holds, let $n \in \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in \Lambda^0_{N,i}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda\in v\Lambda^{\leq n}_{N,i}} T_\lambda T_{\lambda^*} &= \sum_{\lambda\in v\Lambda^{\leq n}_{N,i}} P_i t_\lambda P_i^2 t_{\lambda^*} P_i = \sum_{\lambda\in v\Lambda^{\leq n}_{N,i}} P_i t_\lambda t_{\lambda^*} P_i \\ &= P_i\Big(\sum_{\lambda\in v\Lambda^{\leq n}_{N,i}} t_\lambda t_{\lambda^*}\Big)P_i = P_i\Big(\sum_{\beta\in v\Lambda^{\leq (n_1+N,n_2)}_{N,i}} t_\beta\, t_{\beta^*}\Big)P_i \\ &= P_i q_v P_i = Q_v.\end{aligned}$$

Thus (Q,T) is a Kumjian-Pask $\Lambda_{N,i}$-family in $C_{N,i}$. Write (q^i,t^i) for the universal Kumjian-Pask family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_{N,i})$. The universal property of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_{N,i})$ gives a homomorphism $\pi_{Q,T} : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_{N,i}) \to C_{N,i}$ such that $\pi_{Q,T}(q^i_v) = Q_v$, $\pi_{Q,T}(t^i_\lambda) = T_\lambda$ and $\pi_{Q,T}(t^i_{\lambda^*}) = T_{\lambda^*}$. Thus $\pi_{Q,T}(t^i_\mu t^i_{\nu^*}) = P_i t_\mu P_i t_{\nu^*} P_i = P_i t_\mu t_{\nu^*} P_i$. Since P_i is homogeneous of degree 0 it follows that $\pi_{Q,T}$ is graded. Thus $\pi_{Q,T}$ is injective by the graded-uniqueness (Theorem 4.1). Finally, the range of $\pi_{Q,T}$ is

$$\operatorname{span}\{P_i t_\mu P_i t_{\nu^*} P_i : \lambda,\mu \in \Lambda_N\} = \operatorname{span}\{P_i t_\mu P_i t_{\nu^*} P_i : s(\mu) = s(\nu) \in V_{N,i}, r(\mu), r(\nu) \in V\},$$

which is equal to $C_{N,i}$. □

Lemma 5.6. *Let Λ_N be a rank-2 Bratteli diagram of depth N. Suppose that the set of sources in Λ^{blue} are the vertices on a single isolated cycle in Λ^{red}. Let P be the idempotent $P = \sum_{v\in V_0} p_v$ and $X = V_0\Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_N$. Then $P\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)P$ is isomorphic to $M_X(R[x,x^{-1}])$.*

Proof. Let $Y = \Lambda^{\mathrm{blue}}V_N$ and fix $\dagger \in V_N$. Let $\theta(\alpha,\beta)$ be the matrix units defined at (5.3). The graph Λ_N satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 5.1, and hence

$$w \mapsto \big(\theta(\dagger,\alpha)w\theta(\beta,\dagger)\big)_{\alpha,\beta\in Y}$$

is an isomorphism ψ of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)$ onto $M_Y(p_\dagger\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)p_\dagger)$, and $p_\dagger\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)p_\dagger$ is isomorphic to $R[x,x^{-1}]$ (see Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 for how the isomorphism of Proposition 5.1 decomposes). It suffices to prove that the restriction of ψ to $P\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)P$ has range $M_X(p_\dagger\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)p_\dagger)$. We observe that

$$\theta(\dagger,\alpha)PwP\theta(\beta,\dagger) = \begin{cases}\theta(\dagger,\alpha)w\theta(\beta,\dagger) & \text{if } r(\alpha), r(\beta) \in V_0;\\ 0 & \text{else.}\end{cases}$$

It follows first, that $\theta(\dagger,\alpha)PwP\theta(\beta,\dagger) \neq 0$ implies $\alpha,\beta \in X$, and second, if $\alpha,\beta \in X$, then

$$\theta(\dagger,\alpha)P\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)P\theta(\beta,\dagger) = \theta(\dagger,\alpha)\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)\theta(\beta,\dagger) = p_\dagger\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)p_\dagger.$$

Thus $\psi|$ is onto $M_X(p_\dagger\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_N)p_\dagger)$. □

An idempotent p in R is *infinite* if there exist orthogonal nonzero idempotents $p_1, p_2 \in R$ and elements $x, y \in R$ such that

$$p = p_1 + p_2,\ x \in pRp_1,\ y \in p_1Rp,\ p = xy \text{ and } \ p_1 = yx.$$

A simple ring is *purely infinite* if every nonzero right ideal of R contains an infinite idempotent [6, §1].

Proposition 5.7. *Let Λ be a rank-2 Bratteli diagram, and K a field. If Λ is cofinal and aperiodic, then $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)$ is not purely infinite.*

Proof. Since Λ is cofinal and aperiodic, and K is a field, $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)$ is simple by [8, Theorem 6.1]. Let $P_0 := \sum_{v\in V_0} p_v$. Since the property of being purely infinite and simple passes to corners by [2, Proposition 10], it suffices to prove that $P_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)P_0$ is not purely infinite. We argue by contradiction: suppose that $P_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)P_0$ is purely infinite. Then $P_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)P_0$ contains an infinite idempotent p. Then there exist nonzero idempotents p_1, p_2 and elements x, y in $P_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)P_0$ such that

$$p = p_1 + p_2, \quad p_1p_2 = p_2p_1 = 0, \quad xy = p \quad \text{and} \quad yx = p_1. \tag{5.4}$$

Choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough to ensure that all five elements can be written as linear combinations of elements $s_\lambda s_{\mu^*}$ for which $s(\lambda)$ and $s(\mu)$ are in $\bigcup_{n=0}^{N} V_n$.

Let Λ_N be the rank-2 Bratteli diagram of depth N. Let (q,t) be the generating Kumjian-Pask Λ_N-family in $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N)$ and set $Q_0 = \sum_{v\in V_0} q_v$. Since $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N)$ is canonically isomorphic to the subalgebra $\operatorname{span}\{s_\mu s_{\nu^*} : \mu,\nu \in \Lambda_N\}$ of $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)$ by Lemma 5.4, we may assume that p, p_1, p_2, x and y are all in $Q_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N)Q_0$.

Next we will decompose $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N)$ into a direct sum. Using (KP4$'$),

$$\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N) = \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} : s(\lambda) = s(\mu) \in V_N\}.$$

Partition V_N into subsets $V_{N,i}$, each consisting of the vertices of one isolated red cycle. We claim that if $s(\mu)$ and $s(\alpha)$ are in different $V_{N,i}$, then $t_{\mu^*}t_\alpha = 0$. By way of contradiction, suppose not. By Proposition 3.3, there exists $(\sigma,\tau) \in \Lambda_N \times \Lambda_N$ such that $\mu\sigma = \alpha\tau$ and $d(\mu\sigma) = d(\mu)\wedge d(\alpha)$. Since $s(\mu) = s(\alpha) \in V_N$, both σ and τ are red paths. But $s(\sigma) = s(\tau)$ implies σ and τ lie on the same isolated red cycle, and this implies that $s(\mu) = r(\sigma)$ and $s(\alpha) = r(\tau)$ are in the same $V_{N,i}$, a contradiction. Thus $t_{\mu^*}t_\alpha = 0$, as claimed. It follows that $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N)$ is the direct sum of the subalgebras

$$C_{N,i} := \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} : s(\lambda) = s(\mu) \in V_{N,i}\},$$

and we have

$$Q_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N)Q_0 = \bigoplus_i Q_0 C_{N,i} Q_0.$$

The elements p, p_1, p_2, x and y in $Q_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_N)Q_0$ all have direct sum decompositions, and the elements satisfy the relations (5.4). The component of p_2 is nonzero in at least one summand, and then the same component of the rest must be nonzero too. So we may assume that p, p_1, p_2, x and y are all in $Q_0C_{N,i}Q_0$ for some i.

Now consider the subgraph $\Lambda_{N,i}$ of Λ_N of paths with source and range in $\{v \in \Lambda^0 : v\Lambda V_{N,i} \neq \emptyset\}$. By Lemma 5.5, $C_{N,i}$ is canonically isomorphic to $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_{N,i})$, and by Proposition 5.1, $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda_{N,i})$ is isomorphic to a matrix algebra $M_Y(K[x,x^{-1}])$ for a certain set Y, and by Lemma 5.6 this isomorphism restricts to an isomorphism of $Q_0C_{N,i}Q_0$ onto $M_X(K[x,x^{-1}])$ where $X \subseteq Y$. Pulling the five elements through all these isomorphisms gives us nonzero idempotents q, q_1, q_2 and elements f, g in $M_X(K[x,x^{-1}])$ such that

$$q = q_1 + q_2, \quad q_1q_2 = q_2q_1 = 0, \quad fg = q \quad \text{and} \quad gf = q_1.$$

Evaluation at $z \in K$ is a homomorphism, and so $f(z)g(z) = q(z)$ and $g(z)f(z) = q_1(z)$. Thus $g(z)$ is an isomorphism of $q(z)K^X$ onto $q_1(z)K^X$. So the matrices $q(z)$ and $q_1(z)$ have the same rank. On the other hand, since $q_1(z)$ and $q_2(z)$ are orthogonal, $\operatorname{rank}(q_1(z) + q_2(z)) = \operatorname{rank} q_1(z) + \operatorname{rank} q_2(z)$. Now $q = q_1 + q_2$ implies that $\operatorname{rank} q_2(z) = 0$ for all z. This contradicts that q_2 is nonzero. Thus there is no infinite idempotent in $P_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)P_0$, as claimed. Thus $P_0\,\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)P_0$ is not purely infinite, and neither is $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)$. □

Recall that a matricial algebra is a finite direct product of full matrix algebras and we say an algebra is locally matricial algebra if it is direct limit of matricial algebras.

Theorem 5.8. *Let Λ be a rank-2 Bratteli diagram which is cofinal and aperiodic, and K a field. Then $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)$ is simple, but is neither purely infinite nor locally matricial.*

Proof. By [8, Theorem 6.1], $\mathrm{KP}_K(\Lambda)$ is simple, and by Proposition 5.7 it is not purely infinite. To see that it is not locally matricial, consider the element s_μ associated to a single red cycle μ. Since $v := r(\mu) = s(\mu)$ receives just one red path of length $|\mu|$, namely μ, the Kumjian-Pask relation (KP4′) at v for $n = |\mu|e_2$ (which only involves red paths) says that $p_v = s_\mu s_\mu^*$. But, as seen in the proof of Lemma 5.3, the subalgebra generated by s_μ is isomorphic to the Leavitt path algebra of the directed graph consisting of a single vertex w and a single loop e at w, which is in turn isomorphic to $K[x, x^{-1}]$. Thus s_μ generates an infinite-dimensional algebra, and does not lie in a finite-dimensional subalgebra. □

6. Desourcification

Throughout this section, Λ is a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. In Theorem 7.4 we show that the Kumjian-Pask algebra of Λ is Morita equivalent to a Kumjian-Pask algebra of a certain k-graph $\tilde{\Lambda}$ without sources. The graph $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is called the *desourcification of* Λ. The construction of $\tilde{\Lambda}$, and the Morita equivalence of the C^*-algebras $C^*(\Lambda)$ and $C^*(\tilde{\Lambda})$ goes back to Farthing [13]. Farthing's construction was refined by Robertson and Sims in [24], and then generalised to finitely aligned k-graphs by Webster in [30]. The difference in the approaches is that Farthing's construction adds paths and vertices to Λ to obtain a graph $\overline{\Lambda}$, and the Robertson-Sims-Webster construction abstractly builds a $\tilde{\Lambda}$ which is then shown to contain a copy of Λ. When Λ is locally convex, $\overline{\Lambda}$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ are isomorphic.

We use $\tilde{\Lambda}$, and start by giving the details about $\tilde{\Lambda}$ that we need. Set

$$V_\Lambda := \{(x; m) : x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}, m \in \mathbb{N}^k\} \text{ and } P_\Lambda := \{(x; (m, n)) : x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}, m \leq n \in \mathbb{N}^k\};$$

the vertices and paths of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ are quotients of these sets, respectively. For this, define relations $\approx$ on V_Λ and $\sim$ on P_Λ as in Definitions 4.2 and 4.3 of [30]. First, define $(x; m) \approx (y; p)$ in V_Λ if and only if

(V1) $x(m \wedge d(x)) = y(p \wedge d(y))$ and
(V2) $m - m \wedge d(x) = p - p \wedge d(y)$.

It is straightforward to check that $\approx$ is an equivalence relation, and we denote the class of $(x; n)$ by $[x; n]$. We view $V_\Lambda/\!\approx$ as a set of vertices that includes a copy of the vertices in Λ^0. Indeed, if $v \in \Lambda^0$, then $v = x(0)$ for some $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$; we can think of Λ^0 with the equivalence classes of elements $(x; 0)$, and item (V1) above ensures this identification is well defined. The set $V_\Lambda/\!\approx$ also includes elements that are not identified with vertices in Λ^0. In particular, for each $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ with $d(x) < \infty$, there is one element in $V_\Lambda/\!\approx$ for each $m > d(x)$.

Second, define $(x; (m, n)) \sim (y; (p, q))$ in P_Λ if and only if

(P1) $x(m \wedge d(x), n \wedge d(x)) = y(p \wedge d(y), q \wedge d(y))$,
(P2) $m - m \wedge d(x) = p - p \wedge d(y)$ and
(P3) $n - m = q - p$.

Again, it is straightforward to check that $\sim$ is an equivalence relation, and we denote the class of $(x; (m, n))$ by $[x; (m, n)]$. The next proposition is [30, Proposition 4.9], and says that we can view each $[x;(m,n)] \in P_\Lambda/{\sim}$ as a morphism between vertices $[(x;n)]$ and $[(x;m)]$ in $V_\Lambda/{\approx}$ of degree $n-m$.

Proposition 6.1 (Farthing, Webster). *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. Define*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\Lambda}^0 := V_\Lambda/{\approx} \quad \textit{and}\ \tilde{\Lambda} := P_\Lambda/{\sim},\\
&r,s : \tilde{\Lambda} \to \tilde{\Lambda}^0 \ \textit{by}\ r([x;(m,n)]) = [x;m] \ \textit{and}\ s([x;(m,n)]) = [x;n],\\
&\mathrm{id}([x;m]) = [x;(m,m)],\\
&[x;(m,n)] \circ [y;(p,q)] = [x(0,n\wedge d(x))\sigma^{p\wedge d(y)}(y);(m,n+p-q)], \ \textit{and}\\
&d : \tilde{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{N}^k \ \textit{by}\ d(v) = 0 \ \textit{for all}\ v \in \tilde{\Lambda}^0 \ \textit{and}\ d([x;(m,n)]) = n-m.
\end{aligned}$$

Each of these functions is well defined, and $\tilde{\Lambda} = (\tilde{\Lambda}^0, \tilde{\Lambda}, r, s, \mathrm{id}, \circ, d)$ is a k-graph without sources. We call $\tilde{\Lambda}$ the desourcification *of Λ.*

We have decided to use d, r and s to denote the appropriate maps in both Λ and $\tilde{\Lambda}$. This doesn't seem to cause any confusion. The following remark and lemmas give insight into the structure of $\tilde{\Lambda}$.

Remark 6.2.
(a) The map $\iota : \Lambda \to \tilde{\Lambda}$ defined by $\iota(\lambda) = [\lambda x;(0,d(\lambda))]$ for $x \in s(\lambda)\Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ is a well-defined, injective k-graph morphism [30, Proposition 4.13]. Notice that if $v \in \Lambda^0$, then $\iota(v) = [x;(0,0)]$ for some $x \in v\Lambda^{\leq\infty}$.
(b) The map $\pi : \tilde{\Lambda} \to \iota(\Lambda)$ defined by $\pi([y;(m,n)] = [y;(m\wedge d(y), n\wedge d(y))]$ is a well-defined, surjective k-graph morphism such that $\pi\circ\pi = \pi$ and $\pi\circ\iota = \iota$ [30, page 168].
(c) If $\mu, \lambda \in \iota(\Lambda^0)\tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $d(\lambda) = d(\mu)$ and $\pi(\lambda) = \pi(\mu)$, then $\lambda = \mu$ [30, Lemma 4.19].

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose $\mu := [z;(0,n)] \in \tilde{\Lambda}$. Then $\mu \in \iota(\Lambda)$ if and only if $d(z) \geq n$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mu = [z;(0,n)] = \iota(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Since ι is degree-preserving, $d(\lambda) = n$. Since $\pi\circ\iota = \iota$ we have $\pi(\mu) = [z;(0,n\wedge d(z))] = \iota(\lambda)$. Thus $n \wedge d(z) = n$, that is, $d(z) \geq n$.

Conversely, suppose $d(z) \geq n$. Then factor $z = \lambda y$ where $\lambda \in \Lambda^n$ and $y \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$. Now $\mu = [z;(0,n)] = [\lambda y;(0,d(\lambda))] = \iota(\lambda)$. □

The following straightforward lemma is very useful and is used without proof in [30].

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose $\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $r(\lambda) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$. Then there exists $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ such that $\lambda = [x;(0,d(\lambda))]$.*

Proof. Write $\lambda = [z;(m,n)]$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $z \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$. If $m = 0$, then $d(\lambda) = n$ and we are done. So suppose $m > 0$. Because $[z;m] = r(\lambda) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$, $[z;m] \approx [y;0]$ for some $y \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$. By (V2) $m - m\wedge d(z) = 0$. Then $m = m \wedge d(z)$, and hence $m \leq d(z)$. Let $x := \sigma^m(z)$. It suffices to show that $(x;(0,n-m)) \sim (z;(m,n))$. Items (P2) and (P3) are obvious. To see (P1), notice

$$\begin{aligned}
z(m\wedge d(z), n\wedge d(z)) &= z(m, n\wedge d(z)) = \sigma^m(z)(0, n\wedge d(z) - m)\\
&= x(0, n\wedge d(z) - m) = x(0, (n-m)\wedge d(x))
\end{aligned}$$

as needed. □

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose $v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$ and $\lambda \in v\tilde{\Lambda}^n$ with $\pi(\lambda) = v$. If $\mu \in v\tilde{\Lambda}^n$, then $\lambda = \mu$.*

Proof. By [30, Lemma 4.19] (see Remark 6.2(a)), it suffices to show that $\pi(\mu) = \pi(\lambda)$. Since $r(\lambda) = r(\mu) = v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$, by Lemma 6.4 there exist $x, y \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ such that

$$\lambda = [y; (0, n)], \mu = [x; (0, n)] \text{ and } [x, 0] = [y, 0] = v.$$

By definition of π,

$$\pi(\lambda) = [y; (0, n \wedge d(y))] \text{ and } \pi(\mu) = [x; (0, n \wedge d(x))].$$

By assumption, $\pi(\lambda) = v$, and hence $n \wedge d(y) = 0$. We need to show that $n \wedge d(x) = 0$ as well; we do this by showing that if $n_i \neq 0$ then $d(x)_i = 0$. Suppose $n_i \neq 0$. Since $n \wedge d(y) = 0$ we have $d(y)_i = 0$. But y is a boundary path, and so by Lemma 2.2 this implies $v\Lambda^{e_i} = \emptyset$. But $x(0) = v = y(0)$, and so $d(x)_i = 0$ as well. Thus $n \wedge d(x) = 0$. Now $\pi(\lambda) = v = \pi(\mu)$ and λ, μ have the same degree, so $\lambda = \mu$ by [30, Lemma 4.19]. □

See page 6 for the definition of $\Lambda^{\min}$.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. Then $\tilde{\Lambda}^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu)) = \iota(\Lambda)^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu))$.*

Proof. This is essentially [30, Lemma 4.22]. Since $\iota(\Lambda) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}$, we have

$$\iota(\Lambda)^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu)) \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu)).$$

Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \tilde{\Lambda}^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu))$. Then

$$\iota(\lambda)\alpha = \iota(\mu)\beta = [z; (0, d(\lambda) \vee d(\mu))]$$

for some $z \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ by Lemma 6.4. Now

$$(\iota(\lambda)\alpha)(0, d(\lambda)) = \iota(\lambda) = [z; (0, d(\lambda))]$$

by the factorisation property in $\tilde{\Lambda}$. So $d(z) \geq d(\lambda)$ by Lemma 6.3. Similarly, $d(z) \geq d(\mu)$. Hence $d(z) \geq d(\lambda) \vee d(\mu)$ and so $\iota(\lambda)\alpha \in \iota(\Lambda)$ by Lemma 6.4 again. Now by the unique factorisation property, both α and β are in $\iota(\Lambda)$. Thus

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu)) \subseteq \iota(\Lambda)^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu))$$

as needed. □

7. The Morita equivalence of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$

Throughout this section, Λ is a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and R is a commutative ring with 1. We start by identifying $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ with a subalgebra of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$.

Proposition 7.1. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and let $\tilde{\Lambda}$ be its desourcification. Let (q, t) be a universal $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$-family. Let $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ be the subalgebra of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ generated by $\{q_{\iota(v)}, t_{\iota(\lambda)}, t_{\iota(\mu^*)} : v \in \Lambda^0, \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda\}$. There is a graded isomorphism of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ onto $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$.*

Proof. We show that $(q \circ \iota, t \circ \iota)$ is a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$; we start by verifying (KP1), (KP2) and (KP4′), and then we use Corollary 3.5 to verify (KP3′).

Since (q, t) is a Kumjian-Pask $\tilde{\Lambda}$-family, $\{q_v : v \in \tilde{\Lambda}^0\}$ is an orthogonal set of idempotents, and hence so is $\{q_{\iota(w)} : w \in \Lambda^0\}$. This gives (KP1) for $(q \circ \iota, t \circ \iota)$.

Let $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^{\neq 0}$ with $r(\mu) = r(\lambda)$. Since (KP2) holds for (q, t) and ι is a graph morphism, $t_{\iota(\lambda)}t_{\iota(\mu)} = t_{\iota(\lambda)\iota(\mu)} = t_{\iota(\lambda\mu)}$. Similarly, the other equations in (KP2) hold for $(q \circ \iota, t \circ \iota)$.

For (KP4′), it suffices by Lemma 3.2 to show that for $1 \le i \le k$ with $v\Lambda^{e_i} \neq \emptyset$,

$$q_{\iota(v)} = \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}} t_{\iota(\lambda)} t_{\iota(\lambda)^*}.$$

Suppose $v\Lambda^{e_i} \neq \emptyset$, and let $\mu \in \iota(v)\tilde{\Lambda}^{e_i}$. Then $\mu = [x; (0, e_i)]$ for some $x \in v\Lambda^{\le\infty}$ by Lemma 6.4. Since $v\Lambda^{e_i} \neq \emptyset$ and $r(x) = v$, we have $d(x) \ge e_i$. Thus $\mu = \iota(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}$ by Lemma 6.3, and this λ is unique because ι is injective. Now

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\iota(v)} &= \sum_{\mu \in \iota(v)\tilde{\Lambda}^{e_i}} t_\mu t_{\mu^*} \quad \text{by (KP4) for } (q, t), \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in v\Lambda^{e_i}} t_{\iota(\lambda)} t_{\iota(\lambda)^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (KP4′) holds for $(q \circ \iota, t \circ \iota)$.

For (KP3′), let $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\iota(\lambda)^*} t_{\iota(\mu)} &= \sum_{(\sigma,\tau) \in \tilde{\Lambda}^{\min}(\iota(\lambda), \iota(\mu))} t_\sigma t_{\tau^*} \quad \text{by (3.1)} \\ &= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) \in \Lambda^{\min}(\lambda,\mu)} t_{\iota(\alpha)} t_{\iota(\beta)^*} \quad \text{by Lemma 6.6.} \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.5, (KP3′) holds for $(q \circ \iota, t \circ \iota)$, and hence $(q \circ \iota, t \circ \iota)$ is a Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$.

Let (p, s) be a generating Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. Since $(q \circ \iota, t \circ \iota)$ is a Λ-family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$, the universal property of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ (Theorem 3.7(a)) gives an R-algebra homomorphism $\pi_{q\circ\iota, t\circ\iota} : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) \to \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ such that $\pi_{q\circ\iota,t\circ\iota}(p_v) = q_{\iota(v)}$, $\pi_{q\circ\iota,t\circ\iota}(s_\lambda) = t_{\iota(\lambda)}$ and $\pi_{q\circ\iota,t\circ\iota}(s_{\lambda^*}) = t_{\iota(\lambda)^*}$. Since ι is degree preserving, $\pi_{q\circ\iota,t\circ\iota}$ is graded. The graded-uniqueness theorem (Theorem 4.1) implies $\pi_{q\circ\iota,t\circ\iota}$ is injective. Since $\{q \circ \iota(v), t \circ \iota(\lambda), t \circ \iota(\mu^*)\}$ generates $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$, the range of $\pi_{q\circ\iota,t\circ\iota}$ is $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. □

Proposition 7.2. *Let (Λ, d) be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and let $(\tilde{\Lambda}, d)$ be its desourcification. Let (q, t) be a generating Kumjian-Pask Λ-family in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ be the subalgebra of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ generated by $\{q_{\iota(v)}, t_{\iota(\lambda)}, t_{\iota(\mu^*)} : v \in \Lambda^0, \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda\}$. Then*

$$B(\tilde{\Lambda}) = \operatorname{span}\{t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \tilde{\Lambda}, r(\alpha), r(\beta) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)\}.$$

Proof. The $\subseteq$ direction is obvious. To see the other containment, consider $t_\alpha t_{\beta^*}$ where $\alpha, \beta \in \tilde{\Lambda}, r(\alpha), r(\beta) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$. We may assume $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$ for otherwise $t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} = 0$ by (KP2) and (KP1). Since $r(\alpha), r(\beta) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$, there exist $x, y \in \Lambda^{\le\infty}$ such that

$$\alpha = [x; (0, d(\alpha))] \text{ and } \beta = [y; (0, d(\beta))]$$

by Lemma 6.4. Using the definition of π and the factorisation property in $\tilde{\Lambda}$, there exist $\gamma, \gamma' \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $\alpha = \pi(\alpha)\gamma$ and $\beta = \pi(\beta)\gamma'$. Write $\gamma = [x; (d(\alpha) \wedge d(x), d(\alpha))]$ and $\gamma' = [y; (d(\beta) \wedge d(y), d(\beta))]$.

We claim that $\gamma = \gamma'$. To prove the claim, we show that items (P1)–(P3) hold for $(x; (d(\alpha) \wedge d(x), d(\alpha)))$ and $(y; (d(\beta) \wedge d(y), d(\beta)))$. First notice that (P2) is trivial; both the left and right-hand sides of the (P2) equation are 0. Now (V1) implies that

$$x(d(\alpha) \wedge d(x)) = y(d(\beta) \wedge d(y)) \tag{7.1}$$

and (V2) implies that

$$d(\alpha) - d(\alpha) \wedge d(x) = d(\beta) - d(\beta) \wedge d(y). \tag{7.2}$$

Notice that equation (7.2) is precisely (P3), and (P1) follows immediately from (7.1). Thus $\gamma = \gamma'$ as claimed.

Now we have

$$t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} = t_{\pi(\alpha)} t_\gamma t_{\gamma^*} t_{\pi(\beta)^*}. \tag{7.3}$$

Our next claim is that $t_\gamma t_{\gamma^*} = q_{r(\gamma)}$. Since $\tilde{\Lambda}$ has no sources, (KP4) says that

$$q_{r(\gamma)} = \sum_{\delta \in r(\gamma)\tilde{\Lambda}^{d(\gamma)}} t_\delta t_{\delta^*}.$$

But $\pi(\gamma) = r(\gamma)$ so $r(\gamma)\tilde{\Lambda}^{d(\gamma)} = \{\gamma\}$ by Lemma 6.5. Thus $q_{r(\gamma)} = t_\gamma t_{\gamma^*}$ as claimed. Finally, from (7.3) we have $t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} = t_{\pi(\alpha)} q_{r(\gamma)} t_{\pi(\beta^*)} = t_{\pi(\alpha)} t_{\pi(\beta^*)} \in B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ since the range of π is $\iota(\Lambda)$. □

We are ready to show $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ are Morita equivalent. First, consider how the analogous proof proceeds in the C^*-setting in [30] and [13]. Let A be a C^*-algebra and p a projection in the multiplier algebra $M(A)$ of A. Then pAp is a sub C^*-algebra of A and $\overline{ApA}$ is an ideal of A, and pA is a pAp–$\overline{ApA}$ imprimitivity bimodule , giving a pAp–$\overline{ApA}$ Morita equivalence [22, Example 2.12]. Both Farthing and Webster show that the C^*-algebra $C^*(\Lambda)$ of a k-graph Λ is Morita equivalent to the C^*-algebra $C^*(\tilde{\Lambda})$ of the desourcification $\tilde{\Lambda}$, that $\sum_{v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)} q_v$ converges to a projection p in $M(C^*(\tilde{\Lambda}))$, that p is full in the sense that $C^*(\tilde{\Lambda}) p C^*(\tilde{\Lambda}) = C^*(\tilde{\Lambda})$, and identify $pC^*(\tilde{\Lambda})p$ with $C^*(\Lambda)$. The work required to do this in the algebraic setting of Kumjian-Pask algebras is similar: the sum $\sum_{v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)} q_v$ may not add up to an idempotent p in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$, but we can write down analogues of $p\,\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})p$ without explicit reference to p. If $\iota(\Lambda^0)$ is finite, then $p = \sum_{v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)} q_v$ is defined in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$, and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})p = \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_\mu^* : \lambda, \nu \in \tilde{\Lambda}, r(\mu) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)\}$; notice that the right-hand-side still makes sense when $\iota(\Lambda^0)$ is infinite.

Lemma 7.3. *The subset*

$$M := \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} : \lambda, \mu \in \tilde{\Lambda}, r(\mu) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)\}$$

of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ *is closed under multiplication on the left by* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ *and on the right by* $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. *The subset*

$$N := \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} : \lambda, \mu \in \tilde{\Lambda}, r(\lambda) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)\}$$

of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ *is closed under multiplication on the left by* $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ *and on the right by* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$. *Further,*

$$MN := \operatorname{span}\{mn : m \in M, n \in N\} = \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda}) \text{ and}$$

$$NM := \operatorname{span}\{nm : m \in M, n \in N\} = B(\tilde{\Lambda}).$$

Proof. Let $t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$, $t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} \in M$ and $t_\eta t_{\xi^*} \in B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. Let $a = d(\beta) \vee d(\lambda)$ and $b = d(\mu) \vee d(\eta)$. By Proposition 3.3,

$$t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} = \sum_{d(\beta\sigma) = a, \beta\sigma = \lambda\tau} t_{\alpha\sigma} t_{(\mu\tau)^*} \in M$$

because $r(\mu\tau) = r(\mu) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$. Similarly,

$$t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} t_\eta t_{\xi^*} = \sum_{d(\mu\sigma)=b, \mu\sigma=\eta\tau} t_{\lambda\sigma} t_{(\xi\tau)^*} \in M$$

because $r(\xi\tau) = r(\xi) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$. Thus M is closed under multiplication on the left by $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and on the right by $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. The analogous assertion about N follows from Proposition 3.3 in the same way.

Since $M, N \subseteq \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$, so is MN. For the other inclusion, consider $t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$. We may assume that $t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} \neq 0$, and then $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$. First suppose that $s(\alpha) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$. Then $t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} = t_\alpha q_{s(\alpha)} t_{\beta^*} = t_\alpha t_{s(\alpha)^*} t_{s(\alpha)} t_{\beta^*} \in MN$. Second, suppose that $s(\alpha) \notin \iota(\Lambda^0)$. Then $s(\alpha) = [x; n]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$. Thus $\lambda := [x; (0, n)] \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ and $r(\lambda) = [x; 0] \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$. Then (KP3) gives

$$t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} = t_\alpha q_{s(\alpha)} t_{\beta^*} = t_\alpha t_{\lambda^*} t_\lambda t_{\beta^*} \in MN.$$

Thus $MN = \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$.

Next consider $n = t_\gamma t_{\delta^*} \in N$ and $m = t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} \in M$. Let $c = d(\mu) \vee d(\gamma)$. By Proposition 3.3,

$$nm = \sum_{d(\delta\sigma)=c, \delta\sigma=\lambda\tau} t_{\gamma\sigma} t_{(\mu\tau)^*}.$$

In each summand, $r(\gamma\sigma) = r(\gamma) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$ and $r(\mu\tau) = r(\mu) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$, and hence each summand is in $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ by Proposition 7.2. Thus $NM \subseteq B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. For the other inclusion, consider $t_\eta t_{\xi^*} \in B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. Then $t_\eta t_{\xi^*} = t_\eta q_{s(\eta)} q_{s(\xi)} t_{\xi^*} = t_\eta t_{s(\eta)} t_{s(\xi)} t_{\xi^*} \in NM$. Thus $NM = B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. □

Now we recall the notion of a Morita context from [14, page 41]. Let A and B be rings, M an A–B bimodule, N a B–A bimodule, and

$$\psi : M \otimes_B N \to A \text{ and } \phi : N \otimes_A M \to B$$

bimodule homomorphisms satisfying

$$n' \cdot \psi(m \otimes n) = \phi(n' \otimes m) \cdot n \text{ and } m' \cdot \phi(n \otimes m) = \psi(m' \otimes n) \cdot m \tag{7.4}$$

for $n, n' \in N$ and $m, m' \in M$. Then (A, B, M, N, ψ, ϕ) is a *Morita context* between A and B; it is called *surjective* if ψ and ϕ are surjective.

Theorem 7.4. *Let (Λ, d) be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and let $(\tilde{\Lambda}, d)$ its desourcification. Let (q, t) be a universal $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$-family and $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ be the subalgebra of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ generated by $\{q_{\iota(v)}, t_{\iota(\lambda)}, t_{\iota(\mu^*)} : v \in \Lambda^0, \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda\}$. Let M, N be as in Lemma 7.3. Then*

- (a) *M is a $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$-$B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ bimodule and N is a $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$-$\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ bimodule with the module actions given by multiplication in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$;*
- (b) *there are surjective maps $\psi : M \otimes_{B(\tilde{\Lambda})} N \to \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $\phi : N \otimes_{\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})} M \to \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ such that $\psi(m \otimes_{B(\tilde{\Lambda})} n) = mn$ and $\phi(n \otimes_{\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})} m) = nm$ for $n \in N$ and $m \in M$;*
- (c) *$(\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda}), B(\tilde{\Lambda}), M, N, \psi, \phi)$ is a surjective Morita context between $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$.*

Composing with the isomorphism $\pi_{q\circ\iota, t\circ\iota} : \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda) \to B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ of Proposition 7.1 gives:

Corollary 7.5. *Let* (Λ, d) *be a locally convex, row-finite* k*-graph and let* $(\tilde{\Lambda}, d)$ *be the desourcification of* Λ*. Then there is a surjective Morita context between* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ *and* $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$*.*

Proof of Theorem 7.4. Lemma 7.3 gives (a). For (b) we start by observing that the map $f : M \times N \to \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is bilinear, so that by the universal property of the tensor product there is a unique linear map $\psi_f : M \otimes N \to \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ such that $\psi_f(m \otimes n) = mn$. The range of ψ_f is MN, which is $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ by Lemma 7.3. To see that ψ_f factors through the quotient map $q : M \otimes N \to M \otimes_{B(\tilde{\Lambda})} N$, we observe that for $x \in B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ we have $\psi_f(m \cdot x \otimes n - m \otimes x \cdot n) = (mx)n - m(xn) = 0$. Now there is a unique linear map $\psi : M \otimes_{B(\tilde{\Lambda})} N \to \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ such that $\psi \circ q = \psi_f$. Thus ψ is surjective and $\psi(m \otimes_{B(\tilde{\Lambda})} n) = mn$. That ψ is a bimodule homomorphism follows because the actions are by multiplication. The analogous assertions about ϕ follows in the same way. This gives (b).

For (c) it remains to verify (7.4), but this is immediate since everything is defined in terms of the associative multiplication in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$. □

Let E be a row-finite directed graph, and F the directed graph obtained from E by adding "infinite heads" to sources, as in [10, page 310]. Then the path categories Λ_E and Λ_F are row-finite 1-graphs; E may have sources but is trivially locally convex. By [30, Proposition 4.11], $\tilde{\Lambda}_E$ is isomorphic to Λ_F. The Leavitt path algebra $L_R(F)$ is the universal R-algebra generated by a Leavitt F-family [29, Definition 3.1], and any Leavitt F-family gives a Kumjian-Pask Λ_F-family and vice versa. Thus by Theorem 3.7(a), $L_R(F)$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_F)$ are isomorphic. Similarly, $L_R(E)$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda_E)$ are isomorphic. Thus we obtain the following corollary which is the analogue of the C^*-algebraic result [10, Lemma 1.2(c)].

Corollary 7.6. *Let* E *be a row-finite directed graph, and* F *the directed graph obtained from* E *by adding "infinite heads" to sources. Then there is a surjective Morita context between the Leavitt path algebras* $L_R(F)$ *and* $L_R(E)$*.*

There is a more general procedure, called "desingularisation", which takes a directed graph E that is not necessarily row-finite and constructs a row-finite directed graph F without sources such that $C^*(F)$ and $C^*(E)$ are Morita equivalent [12, Theorem 2.11].

8. Simplicity and basic simplicity

Throughout this section, Λ is a locally convex, row-finite k-graph, $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is its desourcification and R is a commutative ring with 1. We show that the Morita context between $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ of Corollary 7.5 preserves *basic* ideals (see below for the definition). We then transfer simplicity results about $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ proved in [8] to $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$.

A subset $H \subseteq \Lambda^0$ is called *hereditary* if for every $v \in H$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $r(\lambda) = v$ we have $s(\lambda) \in H$. We say H is *saturated* if for $v \in \Lambda^0$,

$$s(v\Lambda^{\leq e_i}) \subseteq H \text{ for some } i \in \{1, ..., k\} \implies v \in H.$$

See [20, page 113]. In this section, we will apply these definitions to $\tilde{\Lambda}$ which has no sources; then the definition of 'saturated' above is equivalent to: or $v \in \Lambda^0$,

$$s(v\tilde{\Lambda}^n) \subseteq H \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}^k \implies v \in H.$$

Lemma 8.1. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ its desourcification. Suppose that H is a saturated and hereditary subset of $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$. Then $v \in H$ if and only if $\pi(v) \in H$.*

Proof. Let $v \in \tilde{\Lambda}^0$. Write $v = [z; m]$ where $z \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}^k$. Then $\pi(v) = [z; d(z) \wedge m]$. Notice that $\lambda := [z; (d(z), m \wedge d(z))] \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ has source v and range $\pi(v)$ and

$$\pi(v)\tilde{\Lambda}^{m-m\wedge d(z)} = \{\lambda\}$$

by Lemma 6.5.

Now suppose $v \in H$. Since

$$s\big(\pi(v)\tilde{\Lambda}^{m-m\wedge d(z)}\big) = \{s(\lambda)\} = \{v\} \subseteq H,$$

and H is saturated, $\pi(v) \in H$ as well. Conversely, suppose $\pi(v) \in H$. Then $r(\lambda) = \pi(v) \in H$ and H hereditary implies $v = s(\lambda) \in H$. □

Following [29], we say an ideal I in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is a *basic ideal* if $rp_v \in I$ for some $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ imply $p_v \in I$. We say $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is *basically simple* if its only basic ideals are $\{0\}$ and $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$.

The Morita context of Theorem 7.4 induces a lattice isomorphism L between the ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and ideals of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ such that $L(I) = NIM$ [14, Proposition 3.5].

Proposition 8.2. *Let $(\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda}), B(\tilde{\Lambda}), M, N)$ be the Morita context of Theorem 7.4 and $L : I \mapsto NIM$ be be the induced lattice isomorphism from the ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ to the ideals of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. Then I is a basic ideal in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ if and only if $L(I)$ is a basic ideal in $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$.*

Proof. Suppose I is a basic ideal of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$. Fix $v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$ and nonzero $r \in R$ such that $rp_v \in L(I)$. Since N and M are subsets of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and I is an ideal of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$, we have $L(I) = NIM \subseteq I$. Thus $rp_v \in I$ and hence $p_v \in I$ because I is a basic ideal. Since $v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$, we have $p_v \in M \cap N$. Now

$$p_v = p_v p_v p_v \in NIM = L(I).$$

Thus $L(I)$ is a basic ideal of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$.

Conversely, let I be an ideal in $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ such that $L(I)$ is a basic ideal of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. We will show I is a basic ideal. Fix $v \in \tilde{\Lambda}^0$ and nonzero $r \in R$ such that $rp_v \in I$. Then v is an element of

$$H_{I,r} := \{v \in \tilde{\Lambda}^0 : rp_v \in I\},$$

which is saturated and hereditary by [8, Lemma 5.2]. Hence $\pi(v) \in H_{I,r}$ by Lemma 8.1 which means $rp_{\pi(v)} \in I$. Notice that $\pi(v) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$ and so $p_{\pi(v)} \in M \cap N$. Then

$$rp_{\pi(v)} = p_{\pi(v)} rp_{\pi(v)} p_{\pi(v)} \in NIM = L(I).$$

Therefore $p_{\pi(v)} \in L(I)$ because $L(I)$ is basic. Thus we have

$$p_{\pi(v)} = p_{\pi(v)} p_{\pi(v)} p_{\pi(v)} \in ML(I)N = I.$$

Now $\pi(v) \in H_{I,1}$ which is saturated and hereditary by [8, Lemma 5.2]. Therefore $v \in H_{I,1}$ by Lemma 8.1; that is $p_v \in I$. □

Combining Proposition 8.2 with the isomorphism of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ onto $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ of Proposition 7.1, the proof of the following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 8.3. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ its desourcification. Then $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is basically simple if and only if $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is basically simple.*

Next we want to transfer results about $\tilde{\Lambda}$ to Λ. To use results already in the literature we need to reconcile some (of the many) aperiodicity conditions that have been used.

Lemma 8.4. *Let Λ be a row-finite k-graph.*

(a) *Suppose that Λ has no sources. The following aperiodicity conditions are equivalent:*
  (i) ("Condition B" from [20, Theorem 4.3] for graphs without sources; our (4.1) reduces to this)
  For every $v \in \Lambda^0$ there exists $x \in v\Lambda^\infty$ such that $\mu \neq \nu \in \Lambda$ implies $\mu x \neq \nu x$.
  (ii) (The "no local periodicity condition" from [23, Lemma 3.2(iii)])
  For every $v \in \Lambda^0$ and all $m \neq n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, there exists $x \in v\Lambda^\infty$ such that $\sigma^m(x) \neq \sigma^n(x)$.
  (iii) (The finite-path reformulation from [23, Lemma 3.2(iv)]; used in [8])
  For every $v \in \Lambda^0$ and $m \neq n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ there exists $\lambda \in v\Lambda$ such that $d(\lambda) \geq m \vee n$ and $\lambda(m, m + d(\lambda) - (m \vee n)) \neq \lambda(n, n + d(\lambda) - (m \vee n))$.

(b) *Suppose that Λ is locally convex. The following aperiodicity conditions on Λ are equivalent:*
  (i) ("Condition B" from [20, Theorem 4.3], this is our (4.1))
  For every $v \in \Lambda^0$, there exists $x \in v\Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ such that $\alpha \neq \beta \in \Lambda$ implies $\alpha x \neq \beta x$.
  (ii) (The "no local periodicity condition" from [24, Definition 3.2])
  For every $v \in \Lambda^0$ and all $m \neq n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, there exists $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ such that either $m - m \wedge d(x) \neq n - n \wedge d(x)$ or $\sigma^{m\wedge d(x)}(x) \neq \sigma^{n\wedge d(x)}(x)$.

Proof. For the equivalences in (a), see [24, Lemma 3.2], and for the equivalences in (b), see [26, Proposition 2.11]. ☐

A locally convex, row-finite graph k-graph Λ is said to be *cofinal* in [24, Definition 3.1] if for every $x \in \Lambda^{\leq\infty}$ and every $v \in \Lambda^0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that $n \leq d(x)$ and $v\Lambda x(n) \neq \emptyset$. When Λ has no sources, the cofinality condition reduces to the one given on page 15.

Theorem 8.5. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph and R be a commutative ring with 1. Then*

(a) $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ *is basically simple if and only if Λ is cofinal and aperiodic;*
(b) $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ *is simple if and only if Λ is cofinal and aperiodic, and R is a field.*

Proof. (a) By Corollary 8.3, $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is basically simple if and only if $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is basically simple. Since $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is row-finite with no sources, by [8, Theorem 5.14], $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is basically simple if and only if $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is cofinal and aperiodic in the sense of condition (aiii) of Lemma 8.4.

By [24, Proposition 3.5], $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is cofinal if and only if Λ is cofinal. By [24, Proposition 3.6], $\tilde{\Lambda}$ has no local periodicity if and only if Λ has no local periodicity. Using Lemma 8.4 it follows that $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is basically simple if and only if Λ is cofinal and aperiodic (in the sense of the equivalent conditions of Lemma 8.4(b)).

(b) By Corollary 7.5, $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is Morita equivalent to $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$. Thus $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is simple if and only if $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is. By [8, Theorem 6.1], $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is simple if and only if R is a field and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is cofinal and aperiodic. The same shenanigans as in (a) now give that $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ is simple if and only if R is a field and Λ is cofinal and aperiodic. ☐

9. The ideal structure

Throughout this section Λ is a locally convex, row-finite k-graph, and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is its desourcification. Recall that $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is the subalgebra of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ generated by $\{q_{\iota(v)}, t_{\iota(\lambda)}, t_{\iota(\mu)} : v \in \Lambda^0, \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda\}$, and is canonically isomorphic to $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ by Proposition 7.1. We now use the Morita context between $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ to show that there is a lattice isomorphism from the hereditary, saturated subsets of Λ^0 onto the basic, graded ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$. This extends [8, Theorem 5.1] to locally convex, row-finite k-graphs.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $\pi : \tilde{\Lambda} \to \iota(\Lambda)$ be the projection defined in Remark 6.2. Then $H \mapsto \pi(H)$ is a lattice isomorphism of the hereditary, saturated subsets of $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$ onto the hereditary, saturated subsets of $\iota(\Lambda^0)$.*

Proof. Let H be a hereditary, saturated subset of $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$. To see that $\pi(H)$ is a hereditary subset of $\iota(\Lambda^0)$, let $v \in \pi(H)$ and suppose $\lambda \in v\iota(\Lambda)$. Since $r(\lambda) \in \pi(H)$ we have $r(\lambda) \in H$ by Lemma 8.1. Then $s(\lambda) \in H$ because H is hereditary. Since $\lambda \in \iota(\Lambda)$ and π is a graph morphism, we have $s(\lambda) = s(\pi(\lambda)) = \pi(s(\lambda)) \in \pi(H)$. Thus $\pi(H)$ is hereditary.

To see that $\pi(H)$ is saturated, let $v \in \iota(\Lambda^0)$, and suppose that $s(v\iota(\Lambda^{\leq e_i})) \subseteq \pi(H)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$. There are two cases. First, suppose that $v\Lambda^{\leq e_i} = \{v\}$. Then $\{v\} = s(v\iota(\Lambda^{\leq e_i})) \subseteq \pi(H)$ gives $v \in \pi(H)$ as required. Second, suppose that $v\Lambda^{\leq e_i} = v\Lambda^{e_i}$. Then $v\iota(\Lambda^{\leq e_i}) = v\tilde{\Lambda}^{e_i}$. Also $\pi(H) \subseteq H$ by Lemma 8.1. Thus $s(v\tilde{\Lambda}^{e_i}) \subseteq H$, and since H is saturated in $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$, we get $v \in H$. Now $v = \pi(v) \in \pi(H)$ as required. Thus $\pi(H)$ is a saturated subset of $\iota(\Lambda)$.

To see that $H \mapsto \pi(H)$ is injective, suppose $\pi(H) = \pi(K)$. Let $v \in H$. Then $\pi(v) \in \pi(H) = \pi(K)$, and hence $v \in K$ by Lemma 8.1. Thus $H \subseteq K$, and the other set inclusion follows by symmetry. Thus $H = K$, and $H \mapsto \pi(H)$ is injective.

To see that $H \mapsto \pi(H)$ is onto, let G be a hereditary, saturated subset of $\iota(\Lambda^0)$. Since $\pi(\pi^{-1}(G)) = G$, it suffices to show that $\pi^{-1}(G)$ is a hereditary, saturated subset of $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$. Let $v \in \pi^{-1}(G)$ and suppose $\lambda \in v\tilde{\Lambda}$. Then $r(\pi(\lambda)) = \pi(r(\lambda)) = \pi(v) \in G$. Since G is hereditary, $s(\pi(\lambda)) = \pi(s(\lambda)) \in G$. Thus $s(\lambda) \in \pi^{-1}(G)$, and hence $\pi^{-1}(G)$ is hereditary. To see $\pi^{-1}(G)$ is saturated, let $v \in \tilde{\Lambda}^0$, and suppose $s(v\tilde{\Lambda}^{e_i}) \subseteq \pi^{-1}(G)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then

$$s(\pi(v)\iota(\Lambda^{\leq e_i})) = s(\pi(v)\pi(\tilde{\Lambda}^{e_i})) = \pi(s(v\tilde{\Lambda}^{e_i})) \subseteq G.$$

But G is saturated in $\iota(\Lambda^0)$, and hence $\pi(v) \in G$. Now $v \in \pi^{-1}(G)$ as needed, and $\pi^{-1}(G)$ is saturated. It follows that $H \mapsto \pi(H)$ is onto.

Finally, $H \mapsto \pi(H)$ is a lattice isomorphism because $H_1 \subseteq H_2$ if and only if $\pi(H_1) \subseteq \pi(H_2)$. ☐

The next lemma is a generalisation of [8, Lemma 5.4] to graphs with possible sources.

Lemma 9.2. *Let G be a hereditary, saturated subset of Λ^0, and J_G be the ideal of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ generated by $\{p_v : v \in G\}$. Then*

$$J_G = \operatorname{span}\{s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \Lambda, s(\alpha) = s(\beta) \in G\}. \tag{9.1}$$

Proof. Denote the right-hand side of (9.1) by J. For $v \in G$, taking $\alpha = \beta = v$ shows $p_v \in J$. Thus J_G is contained in the ideal generated by J. But each $s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} \in J$ is in J_G because $s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} = s_\alpha p_{s(\alpha)} s_{\beta^*}$. Thus (9.1) will follow if J is an ideal. To see this, let $s_\mu s_{\nu^*} \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ and $s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} \in J$ such that $s_\mu s_{\nu^*} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} \neq 0$. Then $r(\alpha) = r(\nu)$ and by Corollary 3.5, $s_\mu s_{\nu^*} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} = \sum_{(\gamma,\delta)\in\Lambda^{\min}(\nu,\alpha)} s_{\mu\gamma} s_{(\beta\delta)^*}$. For any nonzero summand, $r(\delta) = s(\alpha) \in H$ implies $s(\delta) = s(\gamma) \in G$ since G is hereditary. Thus each $s_{\mu\gamma} s_{(\beta\delta)^*} \in J$, and hence $s_\mu s_{\nu^*} s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} \in J$ as well. Similarly $s_\alpha s_{\beta^*} s_\mu s_{\nu^*} \in J$, and it follows that J is an ideal. □

Proposition 9.3. *Let L be the lattice isomorphism from the ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ to the ideals of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ induced by the Morita context of Theorem 7.4.*

(a) *Then I is a graded ideal of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ if and only if $L(I)$ is a graded ideal of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$.*

(b) *Let H be a hereditary, saturated subset of $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$. Then $L(I_H) = J_{\pi(H)}$.*

Proof. (a) Here $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ and $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ are graded by the subgroups

$$\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})_j := \operatorname{span}\{t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \tilde{\Lambda}, d(\alpha) - d(\beta) = j\} \text{ and}$$
$$B(\tilde{\Lambda})_j := \operatorname{span}\{t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \iota(\Lambda), d(\alpha) - d(\beta) = j\} = B(\tilde{\Lambda}) \cap \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})_j,$$

respectively. Let $m \in M$ and $n \in N$. Since M and N are submodules of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$, we can write $m = \sum m_i$ and $n = \sum n_j$ where each $m_j, n_j \in \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})_j$.

Now suppose that I is a graded ideal of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$. To check that $L(I) = NIM$ is graded it suffices to check that every element of $L(I)$ is a sum of elements in $\cup_j (L(I) \cap B(\tilde{\Lambda})_j)$. Let $x \in I$, and write $x = \sum x_l$ where each $x_l \in I \cap \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})_l$. For an element $y = nxm \in L(I)$ we have $y = \sum_{i,j,l} m_i x_l n_j$; each $m_i x_l n_j \in I \cap \mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})_{i+j+l} = I \cap B(\tilde{\Lambda})_{i+j+l}$. Thus $L(I)$ is a graded ideal of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. The other direction follows in the same way.

(b) By [8, Lemma 5.4], $I_H = \operatorname{span}\{t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} : \alpha, \beta \in \tilde{\Lambda}, s(\alpha) = s(\beta) \in H\}$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} L(I_H) &= N I_H M \\ &= \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} t_\sigma t_{\tau^*} : \lambda, \mu, \alpha, \beta, \sigma, \tau \in \tilde{\Lambda}, s(\alpha) = s(\beta) \in H, r(\lambda), r(\tau) \in \iota(\Lambda^0)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

Consider a term $t_\lambda t_{\mu^*} t_\alpha t_{\beta^*} t_\sigma t_{\tau^*}$ as in (9.2). By three applications of Corollary 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} t_\lambda (t_{\mu^*} t_\alpha)(t_{\beta^*} t_\sigma) t_{\tau^*} &= \sum_{(\gamma,\delta)\in\Lambda^{\min}(\mu,\alpha)} \sum_{(\xi,\eta)\in\Lambda^{\min}(\beta,\sigma)} t_\lambda t_\gamma (t_{\delta^*} t_\xi) t_{\eta^*} t_{\tau^*} \\ &= \sum_{(\gamma,\delta)\in\Lambda^{\min}(\mu,\alpha)} \sum_{(\xi,\eta)\in\Lambda^{\min}(\beta,\sigma)} \sum_{(\rho,\epsilon)\in\Lambda^{\min}(\delta,\xi)} t_\lambda t_\gamma t_\rho t_{\epsilon^*} t_{\eta^*} t_{\tau^*} \end{aligned}$$

For each summand $t_\lambda t_\gamma t_\rho t_{\epsilon^*} t_{\eta^*} t_{\tau^*}$, we have $r(\delta\rho) = r(\xi\epsilon) = s(\alpha) \in H$. Since H is hereditary, $s(\rho) = s(\epsilon) \in H$. Thus, from (9.2),

$$L(I_H) = \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_{\tau^*} : \lambda, \tau \in \tilde{\Lambda}, r(\lambda), r(\tau) \in \iota(\Lambda^0), s(\lambda) = s(\tau) \in H\}$$

(the above shows the inclusion $\subseteq$, and the reverse inclusion is trivial). But $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is the subalgebra of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ generated by $\{q_{\iota(v)}, t_{\iota(\mu)}, t_{\iota(\nu)^*} : v \in \Lambda^0, \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda\}$. Thus

$$L(I_H) = \operatorname{span}\{t_\lambda t_{\tau^*} : \lambda, \tau \in \iota(\Lambda), s(\lambda) = s(\tau) \in H \cap \iota(\Lambda^0)\}.$$

Using Lemma 8.1, we have $H \cap \iota(\Lambda^0) = \pi(H)$, and by Lemma 9.1, $\pi(H)$ is a hereditary subset of $\iota(\Lambda^0)$. Thus $L(I_H) = J_{\pi(H)}$ by Lemma 9.2. □

Theorem 9.4. *Let Λ be a locally convex, row-finite k-graph. Then $G \mapsto J_G$ is a lattice isomorphism from the hereditary, saturated subsets of Λ^0 to the basic graded ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$.*

Proof. Since $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is row-finite without sources, $H \mapsto I_H$ is a lattice isomorphism from the hereditary, saturated subsets of $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$ onto the basic, graded ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ by [8, Theorem 5.1]. By Theorem 7.4, $\mathrm{KP}_R(\tilde{\Lambda})$ is Morita equivalent to its subalgebra $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$, and the induced lattice isomorphism sends I_H to $J_{\pi(H)}$ by Proposition 9.3(b). By Proposition 8.2 and Proposition 9.3(a), respectively, the Morita equivalence preserves basic, graded ideals. Thus $I_H \mapsto J_{\pi(H)}$ maps onto the basic, graded ideals of $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$. The canonical isomorphism of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ onto $B(\tilde{\Lambda})$ of Proposition 7.1 is graded, and hence the ideal $J_{\iota^{-1}(\pi(H))}$ of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ corresponding to $J_{\pi(H)}$ is basic and graded, and all basic, graded ideals of $\mathrm{KP}_R(\Lambda)$ arise this way. Composing with the lattice isomorphism $G \mapsto \pi^{-1}(G)$ from the hereditary, saturated subsets of Λ^0 to those of $\tilde{\Lambda}^0$ of Lemma 9.1 gives the lattice isomorphism

$$G \mapsto \pi^{-1}(G) \mapsto I_{\pi^{-1}(G)} \mapsto J_{\iota(G)} \mapsto J_G. \qquad \square$$

References

[1] G. Abrams and G. Aranda Pino, *The Leavitt path algebra of a graph*, J. Algebra **293** (2005), 319–334.

[2] G. Abrams and G. Aranda Pino, *Purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **207** (2007), 553–563.

[3] G. Abrams and G. Aranda Pino, *The Leavitt path algebras of arbitrary graphs*, Houston J. Math. **34** (2008), 423–442.

[4] P. Ara and M. Brustenga, *Module theory over Leavitt path algebras and K-theory*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **214** (2010), 1131–1151.

[5] P. Ara and K.R. Goodearl, *Leavitt path algebras of separated graphs*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **669** (2012), 165-224.

[6] P. Ara, K.R. Goodearl and E. Pardo, *K_0 of purely infinite simple regular rings*, K-Theory **26** (2002), 69–100.

[7] P. Ara, M.A. Moreno and E. Pardo, *Nonstable K-Theory for graph algebras*, Algebra Represent. Theory **10** (2007), 157–178.

[8] G. Aranda Pino, J. Clark, A. an Huef and I. Raeburn, *Kumjian-Pask algebras of higher-rank graphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), 3613–3641.

[9] G. Aranda Pino, E. Pardo and M. Siles Molina, *Exchange Leavitt path algebras and stable rank*, J. Algebra **305** (2006), 912-936.

[10] T. Bates, D. Pask, I. Raeburn and W. Szymański, *The C^*-algebras of row-finite graphs*, New York J. Math. **6** (2000), 307–324.

[11] J. Brown and A. an Huef, *The socle and semisimplicity of a Kumjian-Pask algebra*, arXiv:1201.1888.

[12] D. Drinen and M. Tomforde, *The C^*-algebras of arbitrary graphs*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **35** (2005), 105–135.

[13] C. Farthing, *Removing sources from higher-rank graphs*, J. Operator Theory **60** (2008), 165–198.

[14] J.L. García and J.J. Simón, *Morita equivalence for idempotent rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **76** (1991), 39–56.

[15] K.R. Goodearl, *Leavitt path algebras and direct limits*, in Rings, modules and representations, 165–187. Contemp. Math., **480**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2009.

[16] D. Goncalves and D. Royer, *On the representations of Leavitt path algebras*, J. Algebra **333** (2011), 258–272.

[17] A. Kumjian and D. Pask, *Higher rank graph C^*-algebras*, New York J. Math. **6** (2000), 1–20.

[18] P. Lewin and A. Sims. *Aperiodicity and cofinality for finitely aligned higher-rank graphs*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **149** (2010), 333–350.

[19] D. Pask, I. Raeburn, M. Rørdam and A. Sims, *Rank-two graphs whose C^*-algebras are direct limits of circle algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **239** (2006), 137–178.

[20] I. Raeburn, A. Sims and T. Yeend, *Higher-rank graphs and their C^*-algebras*, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc., **46** (2003) 99–115.

[21] I. Raeburn, A. Sims and T. Yeend, *The C^*-algebras of finitely aligned higher-rank graphs*, J. Funct. Anal. **213** (2004), 206–240.

[22] I. Raeburn and D.P. Williams, Morita Equivalence and Continuous-Trace C^*-Algebras, Math. Surveys and Monographs, vol. 60, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.

[23] D.I. Robertson and A. Sims, *Simplicity of C^*-algebras associated to higher-rank graphs*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **39** (2007) 337–344.

[24] D.I. Robertson and A. Sims, *Simplicity of C^*-algebras associated to row-finite locally convex higher-rank graphs*, Israel J. Math. **172** (2009), 171–192.

[25] L.H. Rowen, *Graduate Algebra: Noncommutative View*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 91, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.

[26] J. Shotwell, *Simplicity of finitely aligned k-graph C^*-algebras*, J. Operator Theory **67** (2012), 335–347.

[27] P. Smith, *Category equivalences involving graded modules over path algebras of quivers*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012), 1780–1810.

[28] M. Tomforde, *Uniqueness theorems and ideal structure for Leavitt path algebras*, J. Algebra **318** (2007), 270–299.

[29] M. Tomforde, *Leavitt path algebras with coefficients in a commutative ring, J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **215** (2011), 471–484.

[30] S.B.G. Webster, *The path space of a higher-rank graph*, Studia Math. **204** (2011), 155–185.

LISA ORLOFF CLARK, CLAIRE FLYNN, ASTRID AN HUEF: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF OTAGO, P.O. BOX 56, DUNEDIN 9054, NEW ZEALAND.